



NyaayaMuktaavali

A treatise on Brahma Sootras
by Sri Sri Raghavendra Swamiji

Vol. 1 of 2

English Translation by

Ravindranath Kadlabal



NyaayaMuktaavali

of Sri Sri Raghavendra Swamiji

Vol. 1

English Translation by

Ravindranath Kadlabal

Nyaaya Muktaavali of Sri Sri Raghavendra Swamiji. Original in Sanskrit with English Translation by Ravindranath Kadlabal. Volume 1 of two volumes.

© Ravindranath Kadlabal for the English Translations.

No. of Pages : 280

Price : 330

Author can be reached at ravindranath_kr@yahoo.com

श्री:

Preface

Vedas form the core of Hindu Philosophy. They are vast in volume and varied in contents. Since they adopt different styles of expression like *samaadhi*, *guhya* and *darshana*, understanding them often poses problems. In some cases they sound absurd as when they say “*mridabraveet* – the clay spoke”, “*aapo abruvan* – waters spoke”, “*teja aikshat* – the fire thought”. Sometimes the expressions sound contradictory like when they say God as “*kevalo nirgunah* – he is alone and has no attributes whatsoever” and at the same time describe him as “*satyam jnaanam anantam* – flawless, full of knowledge and spread everywhere across time, space and qualities”. These things lead to confusion and may even lead to disbelief in Vedas if not resolved. Thus there was a need to form guidelines for interpreting vedas. That was fulfilled by the sage Sri Vedavyasa, who is none other than the God Vishnu, by writing Brahma Sootra, the set of codes that sets the guidelines by taking a sample statement each from vedas for every chapter.

There are in all 564 *sootras* in the said *Brahma Sootra* book, spread across 222 chapters that are grouped in a total of 16 sections distributed in 4 divisions with each one having four sections. Some consider the total number of *sootras* as 555 instead of 564. However the difference is primarily because of clubbing some of the *sootras*. A detailed note on this has been provided by me in the preface of my earlier book on “Brahma Sutras – An Introduction through anubhaasha of Sri Madhwacharya” published by Poornaprajna Samshodhana Trust.

Since these *Brahma Sootras* are in coded format, it is not easy to understand them without the support of commentaries from the learned acharyas. Though there are many such commentaries, the ones written by Sri Sankaracharya, Sri Ramanujacharya and Sri Madhwacharya are considered to be the prominent ones. There are lots of sub-commentaries on these primary commentaries as well.

Sri Sri Raghavendra Teertha Swamiji (1595 – 1671) was a great saint in the religious lineage of Sri Madhwacharya. He has written many commentaries and independent books as well in Sanskrit. His works are generally reader friendly with him explaining the tough words and sentences in great details in simple words. He has written the following books on *Brahma Sootras*:

Bhavadeepa – This is a sub-commentary on the sub-commentary named *Tatvapraakashika*, which in turn is a commentary on *Bhashya* of Sri Madhwacharya.

Parimala - This is a sub-commentary on the sub-commentary named *Nyaaya Sudha*, which in turn is a commentary on *Anuvyaakhyaana* of Sri Madhwacharya.

Tatvamanjari - This is a sub-commentary on the commentary *aNubhashya* of Sri Madhwacharya.

Tantra Deepika – A magnificent book providing step by step guidance on decoding *Brahma Sootras*.

Nyaayamuktaavali – The present book. This is a comprehensive guide on *Brahma Sootras*. Each chapter of “*Brahma Sootras*” has been picked up and described in all its grandeur in a style similar to that of *Tatparya Chandrika* of Sri Vyasaraaja Teertha swamiji. The

language used in this book is a bit tough containing long sentences covering multiple aspects in one breath. The commentary is based on *Bhaashya* of Sri Madhwacharya and often takes support from the sub-commentary *Tatvaprakaashika* of Sri Jayateertha Swamiji.

It was my fortune that my revered guruji Sri Narasimhachar Korlahalli ordered me to explain small portions of this text to my co-disciples in kannada everyday in his presence and by his grace, I could complete the same. Though it was a challenging job, references to *Tatparya Chandrika* and *Bhaavadeepa* books enabled the task. While doing so, a thought struck in me as to why not bring the contents to the English knowing pious people who have an interest to learn but have been denied an opportunity just because they are not conversant with Sanskrit. Hence started penning the translation almost simultaneously and the result is this book.

Translating Sanskrit texts in English is a tough job and it is more so when the subject matter is philosophy. The task is all the more difficult to translate the professionally excellent sentence formations of Sri Sri Raghavendra Teertha Swamiji in English. The style of expressions in Sanskrit and English also vary and I had to, at several places break the sentences and rearrange the flow to make the English content readable and smooth. In spite of that, the English sentences have remained long at many places. I request the readers to excuse me for the same and for my limitations in translation.

My profuse thanks to M/s Notion Press for publishing this book.

Ravindranath Kadlbal

Blank Page

विषयानुक्रमणिका - भाग १	पु. सं.
प्रथमाध्याये प्रथमः पादः	3
॥ ॐ अथातो ब्रह्मजिज्ञासा ॐ ॥ १ ॥	3
॥ ॐ जन्माद्यस्य यतः ॐ ॥ २ ॥	10
॥ ॐ शास्त्रयोनित्वात् ॐ ॥ ३ ॥	17
॥ ॐ तत्तु समन्वयात् ॐ ॥ ४ ॥	21
॥ ॐ ईक्षतेर्नाशब्दम् ॐ ॥ ५ ॥	25
॥ ॐ आनन्दमयोऽभ्यासात् ॐ ॥ ६ ॥	30
॥ ॐ अन्तस्तद्धर्मोपदेशात् ॐ ॥ ७ ॥	39
॥ ॐ आकाशस्तल्लिङ्गात् ॐ ॥ ८ ॥	43
॥ ॐ अत एव प्राणः ॐ ॥ ९ ॥	46
॥ ॐ ज्योतिश्चरणाभिधानात् ॐ ॥ १० ॥	49
॥ ॐ छन्दोऽभिधानान्नेति चेन्न तथा चेतोऽर्पणनिगदात्तथा हि दर्शनम् ॐ ॥११॥	52
॥ ॐ प्राणस्तथानुगमात् ॐ ॥ १२ ॥	56
प्रथमाध्याये द्वितीयः पादः	61
॥ ॐ सर्वत्र प्रसिद्धोपदेशात् ॐ ॥ १ ॥	61
॥ ॐ अत्ता चराचरग्रहणात् ॐ ॥ २ ॥	65
॥ ॐ गुहां प्रविष्टावात्मानौ हि तद्दर्शनात् ॐ ॥ ३ ॥	68
॥ ॐ अंतर उपपत्तेः ॐ ॥ ४ ॥	70
॥ ॐ अन्तर्यम्यधिदैवादिषु तद्धर्मव्यपदेशात् ॐ ॥ ५ ॥	73
॥ ॐ अदृश्यत्वादिगुणको धर्मोक्तेः ॐ ॥ ६ ॥	76
॥ ॐ वैश्वानरः साधारणशब्दविशेषात् ॐ ॥ ७ ॥	80
प्रथमाध्याये तृतीयः पादः	84
॥ ॐ युष्वाद्यायतनं स्वशब्दात् ॐ ॥ १ ॥	84
॥ ॐ भूमा सम्प्रसादादध्युपदेशात् ॐ ॥ २ ॥	88

विषयानुक्रमणिका - भाग १	पु. सं.
॥ ॐ अक्षरमम्बरान्तधृतेः ॐ ॥ ३ ॥	91
॥ ॐ ईक्षतिकर्मव्यपदेशात्सः ॐ ॥ ४ ॥	94
॥ ॐ दहर उत्तरेभ्यः ॐ ॥ ५ ॥	97
॥ ॐ अनुकृतेस्तस्य च ॐ ॥ ६ ॥	105
॥ ॐ शब्दादेव प्रमितः ॐ ॥ ७ ॥	108
॥ ॐ तदुपर्यपि बादरायणः सम्भवात् ॐ ॥ ८ ॥	112
॥ ॐ शुगस्य तदनादरश्रवणात्तदाद्रवणात्सूच्यते हि ॐ ॥ ९ ॥	116
॥ ॐ कम्पनात् ॐ ॥ १० ॥	120
॥ ॐ ज्योतिर्दर्शनात् ॐ ॥ ११ ॥	123
॥ ॐ आकाशोऽर्थान्तरत्वादिव्यपदेशात् ॐ ॥ १२ ॥	126
॥ ॐ सुषुप्त्युत्क्रान्त्योर्भेदेन ॐ ॥ १३ ॥	129
॥ ॐ पत्यादिशब्देभ्यः ॐ ॥ १४ ॥	131
प्रथमाध्याये चतुर्थः पादः	135
॥ ॐ आनुमानिकमप्येकेषामिति चेन्न शरीररूपकविन्यस्तगृहीतेर्दर्शयति च ॐ ॥ १॥	135
॥ ॐ ज्योतिरुपक्रमात् तथाह्यधीयत एके ॐ ॥ २॥	140
॥ ॐ न संख्योपसंग्रहादपि नानाभावादतिरेकाच्च ॐ ॥ ३ ॥	143
॥ ॐ कारणत्वेन च आकाशादिषु यथाव्यपदिष्टोक्तेः ॐ ॥ ४ ॥	146
॥ ॐ समाकर्षात् ॐ ॥ ५ ॥	148
॥ ॐ प्रकृतिश्च प्रतिज्ञादृष्टान्तानुपरोधात् ॐ ॥ ६ ॥	151
॥ ॐ एतेन सर्वे व्याख्याता व्याख्याताः ॐ ॥ ७ ॥	154
द्वितीयाध्याये प्रथमः पादः	156
॥ ॐ स्मृत्यनवकाशदोषप्रसङ्ग इति चेन्नान्यस्मृत्यनवकाशदोषप्रसङ्गात् ॐ ॥ १॥	156
॥ ॐ नविलक्षणत्वादस्य तथात्वं च शब्दात् ॐ ॥ २॥	160
॥ ॐ अभिमानिव्यपदेशस्तु विशेषानुगतिभ्याम् ॐ ॥ ३ ॥	161

विषयानुक्रमणिका - भाग १

पु. सं.

॥ ॐ असदिति चेन्न प्रतिषेधमात्रत्वात् ॐ ॥ ४ ॥	164
॥ ॐ भोक्त्रापतेरविभागश्चेत्स्याल्लोकवत् ॐ ॥ ५ ॥	167
॥ ॐ तदनन्यत्वमारम्भणशब्दादिभ्यः ॐ ॥ ६ ॥	169
॥ ॐ इतरव्यपदेशाद्विताकरणादिदोषप्रसक्तिः ॐ ॥ ७ ॥	171
॥ ॐ श्रुतेस्तु शब्दमूलत्वात् ॐ ॥ ८ ॥	175
॥ ॐ न प्रयोजनवत्त्वात् ॐ ॥ ९ ॥	176
॥ ॐ वैषम्यनैर्घृण्ये न सापेक्षत्वात्तथाहि दर्शयति ॐ ॥ १० ॥	178
॥ ॐ सर्वधर्मापपत्तेश्च ॐ ॥ ११ ॥	180
द्वितीयाध्याये द्वितीयः पादः	183
॥ ॐ रचनानुपपत्तेश्च नानुमानम् ॐ ॥ ११ ॥	183
॥ ॐ अन्यत्राभावाच्च न तृणादिवत् ॐ ॥ २ ॥	185
॥ ॐ अभ्युपगमेऽप्यर्थाभावात् ॐ ॥ ३ ॥	186
॥ ॐ पुरुषाश्मवदिति चेत्तथापि ॐ ॥ ४ ॥	188
॥ ॐ अन्यथानुमितौ च ज्ञशक्तिवियोगात् ॐ ॥ ५ ॥	190
॥ ॐ महदीर्घवद्वा ह्रस्वपरिमण्डलाभ्याम् ॐ ॥ ६ ॥	191
॥ ॐ समुदाय उभयहेतुकेऽपि तदप्राप्तिः ॐ ॥ ७ ॥	196
॥ ॐ नासतोऽदृष्टत्वात् ॐ ॥ ८ ॥	200
॥ ॐ न भावोऽनुपलब्धः ॐ ॥ ९ ॥	201
॥ ॐ नैकस्मिन्नसम्भवात् ॐ ॥ १० ॥	202
॥ ॐ पत्युरसाम्जस्यात् ॐ ॥ ११ ॥	204
॥ ॐ उत्पत्त्यसम्भवात् ॐ ॥ १२ ॥	206
द्वितीयाध्याये तृतीयः पादः	208
॥ ॐ न वियदश्रुतेः ॐ ॥ ११ ॥	208
॥ ॐ एतेन मातरिश्वा व्याख्यातः ॐ ॥ २ ॥	211
॥ ॐ असम्भवस्तु सतोऽनुपपत्तेः ॐ ॥ ३ ॥	213
॥ ॐ तेजोऽतस्तथा ह्याह ॐ ॥ ४ ॥	214

विषयानुक्रमणिका - भाग १	पु. सं.
॥ ॐ आपः ॐ ॥ ५ ॥	215
॥ ॐ पृथिव्यधिकाररूपशब्दान्तरादिभ्यः ॐ ॥ ६ ॥	217
॥ ॐ तदभिध्यानादेव तु तल्लिङ्गात्सः ॐ ॥ ७ ॥	219
॥ ॐ विपर्ययेण तु क्रमोऽत उपपद्यते च ॐ ॥ ८ ॥	221
॥ ॐ अन्तरा विज्ञानमनसी क्रमेण तल्लिङ्गादिति चेन्नाविशेषात् ॐ ॥ ९ ॥	223
॥ ॐ नात्माऽश्रुतेः नित्यत्वाच्च ताभ्यः ॐ ॥ १० ॥	225
॥ ॐ ज्ञोऽत एव ॐ ॥ ११ ॥	226
॥ ॐ उत्क्रान्तिगत्यागतीनाम् ॐ ॥ १२ ॥	228
॥ ॐ व्यतिरेको गन्धवत्तथा च दर्शयति ॐ ॥ १३ ॥	231
॥ ॐ पृथगुपदेशात् ॐ ॥ १४ ॥	232
॥ ॐ यावदात्मभावित्वाच्च न दोषस्तदर्शनात् ॐ ॥ १५ ॥	235
॥ ॐ पुंस्त्वादिवत्त्वस्य सतोऽभिव्यक्तियोगात् ॐ ॥ १६ ॥	237
॥ ॐ कर्ता शास्त्रार्थवत्त्वात् ॐ ॥ १७ ॥	239
॥ ॐ अंशो नानाव्यपदेशादन्यथाचापि दाशकितवादित्वमधीयत एके ॐ ॥ १८ ॥	241
॥ ॐ अदृष्टानियमात् ॐ ॥ १९ ॥	245
द्वितीयाध्यायस्य चतुर्थः पादः	247
॥ ॐ तथा प्राणाः ॐ ॥ १ ॥	247
॥ ॐ तत्प्राक् श्रुतेश्च ॐ ॥ २ ॥	248
॥ ॐ तत्पूर्वकत्वाद्वाचः ॐ ॥ ३ ॥	250
॥ ॐ सप्त गतेर्विशेषितत्वाच्च ॐ ॥ ४ ॥	251
॥ ॐ अणवश्च ॐ ॥ ५ ॥	253
॥ ॐ श्रेष्ठश्च ॐ ॥ ६ ॥	255
॥ ॐ चक्षुरादिवतु तत्सहशिष्ट्यादिभ्यः ॐ ॥ ७ ॥	257
॥ ॐ पञ्चवृत्तिर्मनोवद्वयपदिश्यते ॐ ॥ ८ ॥	259

विषयानुक्रमणिका - भाग १

पु. सं.

॥ ॐ अणुश्च ॐ ॥ ९ ॥	262
॥ ॐ ज्योतिराद्यधिष्ठानं तु तदामननात् ॐ ॥ १० ॥	263
॥ ॐ त इन्द्रियाणि तद्व्यपदेशादन्यत्र श्रेष्ठात् ॐ ॥ ११ ॥	265
॥ ॐ संज्ञामूर्तिक्लृप्तिस्तु त्रिवृत्कुर्वत उपदेशात् ॐ ॥ १२ ॥	267
॥ ॐ मांसादिभौमं यथाशब्दमितरयोश्च ॐ ॥ १३ ॥	269

Blank page

श्रीः
श्रीराघवेन्द्रयतिकृता

॥ श्रीन्यायमुक्तावलिः ॥

Nyaaya-muktaavali

प्रणम्य रमणं लक्ष्म्याः पूर्णबोधगुरुनपि ।
न्यायमुक्तावलिं कुर्मो विदुषां कण्ठभूषणम् ॥

ज्ञानार्थं ब्रह्मर्द्रेन्द्रादिभिरर्थितो भगवान्नाारायणः व्यासत्वेनावतीर्य उत्सन्नान्वेदान्
व्यञ्जयन् तदर्थनिर्णयाय ब्रह्मसूत्रसन्दर्भात्मकं शास्त्रं प्राणिनां हिताय प्रणिनाय ।
तदेतन्त्यायनिबन्धनात्मकशास्त्रस्य बिषयादिमत्तासाधनेन आरम्भणीयत्वं
साधयितुं तदुपयुक्ततया न्यायानुसन्धानात्मक-विचारमननापरनामक-
जिज्ञासाकर्तव्यत्वं साधयितुमिदं सूत्रम् ।

Prayer - After offering our obeisance to the lord of goddess Lakshmi and the revered gurus, we write this “*nyaayamuktaavali*” that would form a necklace of the learned.

Note: Since the author of this book, Sri Sri Raghavendra Swamiji is a monk (*sanyaasi*) and *peethaadhipati*, as a respect to his such a status, he has used plurals as “we” and “our” instead of “I” and “my”. Thus, the plural usage should not be mistaken to mean existence of multiple authors for this work.

The deities *Brahma*, *Indra* etc prayed lord *Naaraayana* for knowledge (vedic) and in response, he incarnated himself as *Vyaasa* and revived the vedic texts that had slipped out of the minds. He then classified them and wrote the collection of *brahma sootras*, the tools for understanding the true meaning of *vedas* for the benefit of *jeevas*. These *sootras* are in the form of maxims (rules of interpretation).

A book should have the minimum requirements of the target audience, a subject, a benefit to be derived and their *inter se* relationship for it being useful.

The first *sootra* affirms the existence of the aforesaid requirements while examining the need for performing *jijnaasa*, the exercise that uses the maxims in discussing the meaning of vedic texts.

प्रथमाध्याये प्रथमः पादः

॥ ॐ अथातो ब्रह्मजिज्ञासा ॐ ॥ १ ॥

athaatho brahma jijnaasa - 1

इति । एतदादिपञ्चाधिकरण्याः अध्यायपादपीठत्वात् शास्त्रमात्रे तदन्येषां प्रायः शास्त्राध्यायपादेषु अन्तर्भावः टीकायां प्रतिनयं स्पष्टः । अनन्तरसङ्गतिश्च अनेकविधा । यथोक्तम्-

आक्षेपिक्यातिदेशिक्यावुपोद्धातापवादते ।

प्रसङ्गश्चेत्यादिरूपा सा चानन्तर्यलक्षणा ॥ (चं) इति ।

It is customary to show the link of each chapter with their previous ones, the section it belongs to, the division under which it is appearing and with the *shaashtra*, the whole of the subject. However for the initial five chapters, the aforesaid links are relevant only for *shaashtra* and not the others since they form the basement upon which the subsequent chapters are built. These linkages for other chapters are clearly explained in “*tatvaprakaashika*”, the commentary written by Sri Sri Jayateertha swamiji supplementing the *bhaashya* of Sri Madhwacharya.

There is one more link “*aanantarya sangati*” - linkage to the previous chapter. This is of many types. Some significant types are:

- *aakshepikee* – an objection to what has been resolved earlier
- *aatideshikee* – providing further explanation of the earlier
- *upodghaatataa* – introductory
- *apavaadatataa* – exception
- *praasangikee* - incidental

An effort is made to present the translation in as simple a language as possible. However, in order to bring it as near to the original text as

possible, often the sentences may get longer and some uncommon words are being brought in. The author (read as translator) may please be excused for the inconvenience caused out of such longer sentences or unfamiliar words.

अस्यैव आदित्वात् नात्र पूर्वसङ्गतिः ।

This being the first chapter, there is no reference to the previous chapter.

विषयो विशयश्चैव पूर्वपक्षस्तथोत्तरः । प्रयोजनं च पञ्चैतान् प्राञ्चोऽधिकरणं विदुः
॥इत्युक्तेः पञ्चावयवी यथाग्रन्थं प्रकाशयते । पौर्वापर्ये सङ्गतिश्च गुरुपादप्रसादतः
॥

The entire of this book is divided into four divisions (*adhyaya*) and each division has four sections (*paada*). Each section has several chapters (*adhikarana*). Each of such *adhikarana* will have the following components:

1. *ViShaya* – a subject – this is picked up from some vedic text.
2. *Vishaya (samshaya)* – doubt.
3. *Poorvapaksha* – the proposition or objections and
4. *Prayojana* – utility / benefit.

The above sloka can be translated roughly as under:

These things are described in the following texts in accordance with the earlier commentaries on the subject along with the context of each *adhikarana* with reference to its previous one. All these are done based on the grace of the revered guruji.

"तद्विजिज्ञासस्व तद्ब्रह्म" (तै. ३-१) इत्यादौ श्रुता जिज्ञासा विषयः । न कर्तव्या उत कर्तव्या इति सन्देहः । तद्वीजं टीकायां प्रतिनयं व्यक्तम् ।

The subject of this chapter is picked up from the statement of *taittiriya upanishat* “*tadvijijnaasasva tadbrahma* – do *jijnaasa* of “that”. “That” is *brahma*”. To do or not to do *jijnaasa* is the doubt. The cause of this doubt is explained in the commentaries (written by Sri Sri Jayateertha swamiji) of every chapter of *brahma sootras*.

न कर्तव्येति पूर्वः पक्षः । विषयादेरभावात् । अनात्मनः असत्यत्वात् । परात्मनः चेष्टादिलिङ्गसिद्धत्वात् । परमात्मनश्च स्वात्मान्यस्य मानाभावेन अभावात् । वेदान्तानां पौरुषेयत्वापौरुषेत्वयोः आसोक्तत्वगुणाभावेन प्रामाण्याभावात् । स्वतःप्रामाण्येऽपि कार्यपरत्वेन सिद्धरूपब्रह्माबोधकत्वात् । सिद्धार्थबोधकत्वेऽपि अद्वैतिरीत्या अखण्डस्वात्ममात्रपरत्वप्रतीतेः स्वात्मनश्च अहंधीसिद्धतया सन्देहाभावेन विषयत्वायोगात् । देहादिभिन्नत्वाणुत्वादेरपि अनात्मतया असत्यत्वात् । सत्यपि तज्ज्ञाने अपवर्गस्य अन्यस्य वा फलस्य अनुपलम्भेन तस्य तत्फलत्वायोगात् । विषयप्रयोजनयोरभावे अधिकारिसम्बन्धयोः सुतरामभावात् । अस्तु वा अन्यद्ब्रह्म विषयः । तथापि न जिज्ञासा फलवती । न तावद्ब्रह्मज्ञानं तस्याः फलम् । तस्य “कर्मणा ज्ञानमातनोति” इत्यादिना कर्मणैव सिद्धेः । तस्य स्वतोऽपुमर्थत्वाच्च । नापि तद्वारा ब्रह्मप्रासादः फलम् । तस्यापि “तत्कर्म हरितोषं यत्” इत्यादिना कर्मणैव सिद्धेः । स्वतोऽपुमर्थत्वाच्च । नापि तद्वारा मोक्षः फलम् । तस्यापि “अपाम सोमममृता अभूम” इत्यादिना कर्मणैव सिद्धेः । मिथ्याभूतबन्धनिवृत्तिरूपमोक्षस्य प्रसादनैरपेक्ष्याच्च । अस्तु वा मोक्षरूपं फलमपि ज्ञानप्रसादद्वारा । तथापि तस्याः नाधिकारी । मुमुक्षुमात्रस्य अधिकारित्वे “स्त्रीशूद्रादेरप्यधिकारप्राप्त्या स्त्रीशूद्रब्रह्मबन्धूनां त्रयी न श्रुतिगोचरा” इत्यादिविरोधात् । अन्यस्य च तद्व्यावृत्ताधिकारस्याभावादिति ॥

The objection begins with negating the requirement to do *jijnaasa*. For

- The aspect does not have the requirements of *viShaya* (subject) etc.

There are only two things in the world - *jada* (inanimate / inert) and *chetana* (animate / living). These are also called

as *anaatma* and *aatma* respectively. *Aatma* is again two types – *paraatma* and *paramaatma*. *Paraatma* is *jeeva* (soul or spirit) and *paramaatma* is God. *Anaatma* cannot be the subject, for it does not exist in reality.

To be a subject of *jijnaasa* (inquest), there should be some doubt or uncertainty. It does not exist in respect of *jeeva* who is well known by virtue of the activities around. When a body is active, it is because of the presence of *jeeva* in it. In the absence of *jeeva*, it becomes a corpse, an inanimate object.

The subject of *jijnaasa* cannot even be God. There is no evidence to say that he is different from *jeevas*.

The vedantic literature comprising of *vedas* and other authored texts are not authentic since they are not *aaptokta* – written by a trustworthy person (there are three conditions like *vaktraanukoolya*, *shrotraanukoolya* and *prasangaanukoolya* for a text to be considered as *aaptokta*. Their details are not discussed here for the purpose of brevity). *Vedas* have no author and hence cannot be *aaptokta*. Though other texts have authors, their trustworthiness is not proved and hence cannot be considered as *aaptokta*. If their texts are to be taken as evidences for their trustworthiness, it would mean interdependence (*anyonyaasraya*), for till such time their texts are proved authentic, they cannot stand in evidence to the trustworthiness of the author and till the time trustworthiness of the author is proved, their texts cannot be considered as authentic.

If *vedas* are to be considered as inherently authentic, they are so in respect of procedures (*yaaga* etc) that need to be performed and not in respect of God who is existing and not the one to be created. Even if they are to be considered as describing God, they would, as per *advaita* speak of one

unqualified *chetana* that is already experienced by every one as “me”. Hence there does not exist a doubt to resolve which, one should do *jijnaasa*. Even the attributes of “being different from the bodies”, “being of atomic size” etc are also fallacies since the said attributes are *anaatma*. Even if they are real, their knowledge does not lead to either *moksha* or any other benefit.

Since there is neither a valid subject nor a benefit for *jijnaasa*, an *adhikaari* (one who would perform *jijnaasa*) and their inter se relationship stand negated automatically. Even if it is assumed that there exists *Brahma* that is different from *jeevas* and thus forms the subject of *jijnaasa*, that still would not make it worthwhile, for there is no benefit to be gained out of it. *Brahma jnaana* (knowledge of *brahma*) cannot be considered as the benefit of *jijnaasa*. It could as well be obtained through *karma* (religious procedures). So say the scripts “*karmanaa jnaanam aatanoti* – knowledge is achieved through *karma*). This apart, *brahma-jnaana* is not a *purushaartha* (something that is craved for). It cannot be considered as the means for achieving *prasada* (grace / favour) of God. That can even be achieved through *karma* – so say the scripts (*tatkarma hari tosham yat*). This *prasaada* is not a *purushaartha* on its own, to be craved for.

If *prasaada* is considered as something desired on account of it leading to *moksha*, even that would not serve the purpose. For, *moksha* is achievable through *karma*, which is an easier option. So says *veda* - “*apaama somam amrita abhooma* – lets perform *somayaaga*, drink *soma* and thereby become immortal”.

This apart, why should there be *prasaada* for *moksha*, which is nothing but removal of *bandha*, the bondage to the

cycle of births and deaths? For, *bandha* is a fallacy that disappears on its own with the advent of knowledge.

Even if *moksha* is considered as the benefit of *jijnaasa*, there is no *adhikaari* (eligible person) for *jijnaasa*. If a desire for *moksha* itself is to be treated as an eligibility, then even a woman and *shoodra* should also be eligible for it. This is not true. *Veda* specifically prohibits study of *veda* (and *jijnaasa* that augments such a study) by such persons. There is no other criteria that is stated as pre-qualification for *jijnaasa*.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ अनात्मपरात्मस्वात्मनां अविषयत्वेऽपि जिज्ञास्ये श्रुतेन यौगिकेन ब्रह्मशब्देन अवयवशक्त्या "अथ कस्मादुच्यते ब्रह्मेति बृहन्तो ह्यस्मिन् गुणा" इत्यादिश्रुत्या च अन्यत्रासम्भावितदेशकालगुणापरिच्छेदवद्वस्तुवाचिना जीवान्यविष्णवाख्यवस्तुसिद्ध्या तस्य च सगुणनिर्गुणाल्पगुणत्वादिना विप्रतिपत्तेः सन्दिग्धतया विषयत्वसम्भवात् । तज्ज्ञानोत्थतत्प्रसादजन्य-मुक्त्याख्यफलवत्त्वात्तदिच्छोरधिकारिणः सत्त्वेन तत्सम्बन्धस्यापि सत्त्वात् वेदप्रामाण्यादेश्च मूलग्रन्थेषु साधनान्नाद्यः पक्षो युक्तः । नापि द्वितीयः । श्रवणं मननं चेति भाष्योक्तस्मृत्या श्रवणादिरूपजिज्ञासाया एव ज्ञाने प्रधानसाधनत्वेन कर्मणस्तदङ्गत्वात् तस्य स्वतो अपुमर्थत्वेऽपि प्रसादद्वारा मोक्षहेतुत्वेन पुमर्थत्वाच्च । कर्मणा त्वघम इति स्मृत्या ज्ञानजन्यप्रसादस्यैव मुक्तिहेतुत्वाच्च । बन्धस्य तु अक्षादिमानसिद्धत्वेन सत्यतया मोक्षस्य प्रसादसापेक्षत्वात् । कर्मणा अमृतत्वोक्तेश्च "अमृतो वाव सोमपो भवति यावदिन्द्र" इत्यादिना गौणत्वात् । नापि तृतीयः । मुमुक्षुमात्रस्यानधिकारित्वेऽपि "भक्तिमान्परमे विष्णौ" इत्यादिस्मृत्या अध्ययनशमदमादिमतोऽधिकारिविशेषस्य सम्भवाच्च कर्तव्या जिज्ञासेति ॥ तत्र भाष्यटीकयोः मोक्षस्य कर्मजन्यत्वशङ्कासमाध्योरनुक्तावपि "जिज्ञासोत्थज्ञानजात् तत्प्रसादादेव मुच्यते" इत्यनुव्याख्यानस्थैवकारेण सूचितत्वादविरोध इति । अत्र पूर्वोत्तरपक्षयोः जिज्ञासानारंभारम्भौ फले ॥१॥

It is true that *anaatma*, *jeeva* and oneself may not be a subject for *jijnaasa*. However, the subject of *jijnaasa* is stated as "*Brahma*" in

the *sootra*. This word is not just an identifier but has a lot of inherent meaning. *Veda* says “why is he called *Brahma*? He is so because, he is full of *gunas* – the positive qualities”. This means, he is the one who is spread fully in space, time and attributes – a thing that is not possible with any *jeeva*. Such a person is debated as having or not having qualities. Thus there is a doubt that justifies a discussion and God becomes the subject of it. Since *jijnaasa* leads to realization of God, which in turn results in getting the *prasaada* of God, thereby securing *moksha*, the most sought after result, it stands proved that *jijnaasa* has a benefit to be derived. Since there are people who are desirous of *moksha*, they form *adhikaari* and with the existence of a subject, a benefit and *adhikaari*, it is easy to derive their inter se relationship. Hence this book (*brahma sootra*) has all the four ingredients to be considered as authentic and worthy. Since this subject revolves around vedic texts, it is essential to know the authenticity of *vedas*. That however has been described in other source documents like *brahma tarka* (This is a book written by sage Vedavyaasa) and *sootra bhaashya* of Sri Madhwacharya.

Now let us examine the other objection that while *jnaana*, *prasaada* or *moksha* can directly be obtained with the easier option of *karma*, why should one practice *jijnaasa* – The scope of *jijnaasa* is not just a debate but encompasses *sravana* (listening / learning), *manana* (discussion for removal of errors and doubts in understanding) and *dhyaana* (uninterrupted mental activity of recollection of the qualities of God – meditation in a sense). The scripts say that only this and this *jijnaasa* alone would lead to realization of God. *Karma* forms a supporting aspect for *jijnaasa* and not the primary one. Though realization in itself is not a *purushaarth* as presented in the earlier argument, it becomes a desired aspect in view of the same causing the ultimate benefit of *moksha*. The scripts say that *karma* can only secure temporary and

minor benefits. Since the bondage with the cycle of births and deaths is experienced as real and known as such through other evidences, it does not go away with the acquisition of knowledge but has to be removed by God and hence his *prasaada*, grace is essential.

The quotations from *veda* in support of *karma* causing immortality through *soma yaaga* etc refer to a qualified immortality and not the absolute one. Veda says “those who have performed *soma yaaga* would remain immortal till this *Indra* exists” etc.

Though it is true that a mere desire for *moksha* would not make a person eligible for *jijnaasa*, a desire backed by *adhyayana* (study of the base subjects), *shama* (mind, set in *Vishnu*), *dama* (control over senses) etc makes one an *adhikaari*.

Hence it is essential to practice *jijnaasa*.

This book consolidates the discussions on *brahma sootras* as detailed in the *bhaashya* of Sri. Acharya and *tatvapraakaashika*, the commentary on it by Sri. Jayateertha swamiji. Though the topic of *karma* causing immortality is not discussed in any of the above, the same is discussed here to cover what has been expressed Sri Acharya in *anuvyaakhyaana* as “*jijnaasottha jnaanajaat tatprasaadad eve mucyate*”. The word “*eva* – alone” emphasizes the role of *prasaada* in getting *moksha*.

The benefit of this chapter is lies in an objection on the need for *jijnaasa* and an affirmation for it through the discussions.

॥ ॐ जन्माद्यस्य यतः ॐ ॥ २ ॥

janmaadyasya yatah – 2

पूर्वोक्तविशिष्टाधिकारिकमोक्षफलकजीवान्यधर्मिकगुणपूर्णत्वप्रकारकजिज्ञासाक्षेपे ण पूर्वपक्षोत्थानादाक्षेपिकी सङ्गतिः । प्रागुक्तजिज्ञास्यब्रह्मणो लक्षणमुच्यते इति वा पूर्वाधिकरणेन सङ्गतिः । तैत्तिरीये श्रुतं "यतो वा इमानि भूतानि जायन्ते येन जातानि जीवन्ति यत्प्रयन्त्यभिसंविशन्ति तद्विजिज्ञासस्व तद्ब्रह्म" इति (३-१)। यत्प्रयन्ति प्रलय इत्यर्थः । यदभि स्वेच्छया संविशन्ति मुक्तावित्यर्थः । तत्र तद्ब्रह्मेत्युक्तं ब्रह्म किं जीवो विष्णुर्वेति सन्देहः ।

It is said in the previous chapter that *jijnaasa* be done

- by those having the specified qualities
- for securing the benefit of *moksha*
- in respect of the one who is different from *jeeva* and is full of positive attributes.

This chapter resolves an objection over the said conclusion and hence relates to the previous one through *aakshepa* – objection.

This chapter also provides *lakshana* – unique description of what has been referred to as *Brahma* in the previous chapter and hence relates to it as an explanatory one.

taittireeya upanishat says “perform *jijnaasa* of the one, because of whom all these living objects are born, because of whom they live and because of whom they disintegrate or attain *moksha*. He is *Brahma*”. The term “disintegrate” used here and in the subsequent part of this book would not mean a total destruction of *jeeva* but a removal of all external wrappers (bodies) that would have caused his rebirth. It is a near equivalent of the word *laya* in Sanskrit.

Whether *Brahma* as described above is *Vishnu* or *jeeva* is the doubt that is being resolved here.

पूर्वपक्षस्तु ॥ बृहज्जातिजीवकमलासनशब्दराशिष्वित्युक्तेः ब्रह्मशब्दस्य जीवे यौगिकार्थस्यायोगेन रूढत्वात् विष्णौ तु रूढेरभावात् गुणपूर्यभावापातेन

अयौगिकत्वायोगाच्च योगादूढेर्बलीयस्त्वात् यतो वा इति पूर्ववाक्योक्तकारणत्वस्य अदृष्टद्वारा जीवेऽपि सम्भवादत एव जात्यादेस्त्रासम्भवात् आत्मा वा अरे द्रष्टव्य इत्यादिमननविधायकवाक्यान्तरे जीवे प्रसिद्धात्मपदयप्रयोगाच्च जीव एवेदं ब्रह्म । तस्य च अहंशीसिद्धत्वान्न जिज्ञासा कार्येति ।

The dictionary meaning of *brahma* is “*jaati* – commonness like humanity in humans”, “*jeeva*”, “*Kamalaasana* – Deity with four-heads”, and “*Veda*”. The literal meaning of *Brahma* is “complete in attributes”. This does not fit in *jeevas* as they have limited number of qualities and each of such qualities is held in small proportions. Hence it is only the *roodhi* – the usage that can identify *jeeva* with the name *Brahma*. In the case of *Vishnu*, there is no usage of the term and it is inevitable to accept the literal meaning (*yoga* meaning), as otherwise that would mean negating the completeness of *Vishnu* in his attributes. In interpretations, *roodhi* stands stronger than *yoga*. Hence the term *Brahma* referred to in the quoted text refers to *jeeva*. This would pose a question as to how *jeeva* could be considered as the creator etc of the universe? True, he forms the cause through his *adrishta* – virtues and sins. Sounds strange? If I have the *adrishta* to own a house in a layout in Bangalore with all civic amenities, to fulfill the same, Bangalore city should be formed, it should grow to necessitate formation of a layout in the specified location, it should have roads, water supply, electricity connections, drainage system etc. And these things cannot be made available in the layout as stand alone items. They need to get connected to their respective larger networks. Without these things, my *adrishta* cannot be fulfilled. Is it not then that my *adrishta* has caused the entire of above? This is the opinion of *nayyayikaas*.

The other meanings like *jaati* do not fit in as they do not cause the creation of universe etc.

In another vedic text it is said “*aatma vaa are drashtavya* etc”. With the words *drashtavya* etc, it refers to *jijnaasa* and the subject of it is indicated by the word “*aatma*”. This word is popular in *jeeva*. Hence it is *Jeeva* that is stipulated as the subject of *jijnaasa* and since he is known by the experience of “me”, there is no ambiguity that would justify a *jijnaasa*. Hence *jijnaasa* should not be done.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ यतो वा इत्यादिपूर्ववाक्योक्तजगज्जन्मादिकारणत्वस्य “य उ त्रिधातु पृथिवीमुत द्याम्” इत्यादिना विष्णवेकनिष्ठत्वात् अदृष्टद्वारा जीवकारणतापरत्वे इमानीति सर्वनाम्नः सङ्कोचकाभावात् अभिसंविशन्ती-त्युक्तमुक्तप्राप्यत्वस्य सर्वथाऽयोगात् इतरव्यपदेशादिति द्वितीये जीवकर्तृतायाः निरसिष्यमाणत्वाच्च जन्मादिकारणत्वबाधकेन रूढेः त्याज्यत्वात् आत्मा वा अरे इत्यत्र जिज्ञास्ये श्रुतात्मशब्दस्य स्वशब्दादिति वक्ष्यमाणन्यायेन विष्णुवाचित्वात् तदेव ब्रह्म परमं कवीनामिति विद्वद्भूतिसत्त्वात् तस्याश्च अज्ञरूढितो बलवत्त्वात् योगरूढिभ्यां गुणपूर्णो विष्णुरेव ब्रह्मेति तस्य सन्दिग्धत्वात्कर्तव्यैव तज्जिज्ञासेति।

The creation etc of the universe as indicated by the quoted text “*yato vaa..*” is the unique quality of *Vishnu*. Another vedic text says “he who has created the earth and sky from *tridhaatu* – a combination of *prakriti* (the subtle matter), *purusha* (*jeeva*) and *kaala* (time)” as *Vishnu*. The reasoning of *adrishta* presented earlier can at best be limited to certain small aspects but never for everything as indicated by the word “*imaani* – these” meaning everything in the universe. Moreover, *adrishta* forming a cause as described above does not make *jeeva* a creator in the sense of the word. This apart, the word “*abhisamvishanti*” in the quoted text says this person as the destination for the liberated *jeevas*. Such a destination cannot be another *jeeva*. In the second division here, the independence of *jeeva* in performing any act is conclusively denied. When he has no independence in performing any act, how

can he be the creator etc of the universe? Hence the usage of the term *brahma* in *jeeva* deserves to be ignored. The word “*aatma*” in the quoted text where *aatma* is presented as the subject of *jijnaasa* also refers to God as being explained in the *sootra* “*dyubhvaadyaayatanaam svashabdaat* (1-3-1). The word *brahma* is also found to be addressing *Vishnu* in the usage of learned people as can be known from the vedic text “*tadeva brahma paramam kaveenaam*”. The usage of the learned people is certainly more powerful than that of ignorant. As such, it stands proved that the word *Brahma* refers to *Vishnu*, who is full of qualities, both by its literal meaning and the usage.

वर्णकान्तरं तु ब्रह्मशब्दः प्रसिद्धजीवपरः उतार्थान्तरपर इति सन्देहे अन्त्ये तस्यार्थस्य तद्वाचितायाः तत्र तात्पर्यस्य च कल्प्यत्वादौरवम् । आद्ये तु लाघवम्, जीवस्याकल्प्यत्वात् बृहज्जातिजीवेत्यभिधानात् शक्तेरपि कृत्तत्वात् अबाधेन तात्पर्यस्यापि सिद्धत्वात् जीवपर एवेति प्राप्ते “यन्न दुःखेन संभिन्नं न च ग्रस्तमनन्तरम् । अभिलाषोपनीतं च सुखं स्वर्गपदास्पदम्” इति श्रुतेः स्वर्गपदस्य चन्दनादिरूपप्रसिद्धार्थत्यागेन अप्रसिद्धार्थपरत्ववद्ब्रह्मशब्दस्यापि यतो वेत्यादिवाक्यदोषात् प्रसिद्धार्थत्यागेन अप्रसिद्धार्थपरत्ववद् ब्रह्मशब्दस्यापि यतो वेत्यादिवाक्यशेषात् प्रसिद्धार्थत्यागेनाप्रसिद्धार्थपरत्वोपपत्तिरिति सिद्धान्त इति वा अलौकिकविशेष्यपरत्वे गौरवात् प्रसिद्धविशेष्यपरत्वे लाघवात् तदनुसारेण जीवे सम्भवद्गुणपूर्तिरेव प्रवृत्तिनिमित्तं न तु सिद्धान्त्यभिमतगुणपूर्तो तात्पर्यमिति जीवपर एवेति प्राप्ते कारणत्वेनैव बाधकेन अलौकिकविशेष्यपरत्वं ततश्च सङ्गोचकाभावात् सर्वगुणपूर्तिरेव प्रवृत्तिनिमित्तमित्यर्थान्तरपर एवेति सिद्धान्तः इतीदमेकम् । अन्यत्तु पूर्वसूत्रे जिज्ञासोत्थज्ञानजन्यप्रसादद्वारा मोचकत्वाद्विष्णोः जिज्ञासा कार्येति प्रागभिहितमयुक्तम् । तथात्वे बन्धकत्वात्तज्जिज्ञासा न कार्येत्यपि स्यात् । न चायमबन्धकः, जीवस्याबद्धत्व-स्वबद्धत्वयोरयोगेन अन्यबद्धत्वे वाच्येऽन्यस्य चेतनस्याचेतनस्य वा ईशाधीनत्वेन पुनरीश्वरस्य बन्धकत्वेनाजिज्ञास्यता । अन्याधीनत्वे स्वानधीनकृतात् बन्धान्मोचकत्वं नेशस्येति न तजिज्ञासा कार्येति प्राप्ते

अप्रसन्नस्य बन्धकत्वं प्रसन्नस्य तु मोचकत्वमिति तत्प्रसादहेतुज्ञानजननाय तज्जिज्ञासा कार्येति सिद्धान्त इति ।

Another discussion on the same subject is as under:

While the word “*Brahma*” is well known to address *jeeva*, if we are to say it refers to some other person or object, we need to envisage the same being *vaachya* (addressee of the word) and an existence of the qualities spoken by it in him. This would mean a defect of “*kalpana gourava* – too much of an imagination”. If the word is taken to mean *jeeva*, it has the advantage of *laaghava* – being short (absence of imaginations), being the dictionary meaning and the one possessing the qualities as indicated in the literal meaning. Hence *Brahma* should mean only *jeeva*. This proposition is denied as under:

- It is not always appropriate to accept only the popular meaning. Though the word “*swarga*” refers to the objects of pleasure like sandal wood paste by its usage, the description “that pleasure which is not tainted with sorrow, has no gaps in it and fetches all that is desired is called *swarga*”, refers it to the pleasure itself. Similarly here, the usage of the word “*Brahma*” in *jeeva* should be discarded to mean him to be *Vishnu* as supported by the vedic text “*yato vaa imaani bhootaani jaayante*” etc.
- Assigning attributes to an unearthly object would attract the defect of “multiple imaginations” (*kalpana gourava* – as it involves assuming the existence of such an object and the existence of the qualities being attributed to it) whereas doing it for a known object is a straight task (*laaghava*). Hence it is more proper to mean *jeeva* by the word *Brahma* by accepting the completeness of qualities, the literal

meaning, to the extent it can fit in to *jeeva*, but not in its absolute sense as argued in *siddhaanta* –

- this argument is invalid. For, it would go against the fact of *Brahma* being the creator etc of the universe, which a *jeeva* cannot. There is also no reason for considering a limited meaning for the “completeness” of qualities. Hence the literal meaning of the word “*Brahma*” stands in its absolute sense of completeness.
- In the previous *sootra* it is said that *Vishnu* would release us from this bondage of *samsaara* (cycle of births and deaths) when he gets pleased by the knowledge obtained through *jijnaasa* and hence the need for *jijnaasa* – this is not correct. If *jijnaasa* is to be done because he is the one who releases us from the bondage, as a corollary *jijnaasa* should not be done since he is the one who binds us. It cannot be denied that he binds us – since *jeeva* stands bound to *samsaara* and since he cannot bind himself it precipitates to the fact the only one available to bind him is *Vishnu*. If he were not the binder, then he cannot be the releaser as well. How can he release the bondage caused by some one else? Hence *jijnaasa* should not be done -
- This is not true. He causes the bondage when not pleased and releases the bond when he is pleased. Hence it is essential to do *jijnaasa* that would please him.

अत्राद्यं टीकाभिप्रेतम्, अन्त्ये तु सुधाभिप्रेते । तत्राप्यन्त्यमुपासनापादे ध्येयम् ।

The first one of the above is as in *tatvaprakashika* and the other two are from *Nyaaya Sudha*. Of the later two, the last one is from its *upaasana paada* (Third section of third division).

आद्ये ब्रह्मशब्दस्य यतो वा इति वाक्य एव पूर्वपक्षे विष्णुपरत्वं नाभिप्रेतम् । द्वितीये तु सर्वत्रापीति भेदः । अन्त्ये मुक्तिरस्य यत इति सूत्रे विन्यसितव्ये जन्मादीति सृष्टिहेतुत्वोक्तिर्मोचकत्वसम्भावनार्थेति ध्येयम् । अत्र जिज्ञासाकर्तव्यत्वं फलं स्पष्टम् ॥ २ ॥

In the first proposition, the vedic text “*yato vaa imaani*” itself is twisted towards *jeeva*. In the second one, it is a generic one applicable to all references. The third one examines the very formation of *sootra* – it should have been “*muktiḥ asya yataḥ*” instead of “*janmaadiḥ asya yataḥ*”, for *jijñaasaa* is intended in securing *moksha*. True, the word *janmaadiḥ* is used to indicate that the one who can cause birth etc, would certainly cause *moksha* as well.

॥ ॐ शास्त्रयोनित्वात् ॐ ॥ ३ ॥

Shaastrayonitvaat – 3

उक्तलक्षणस्य रुद्रादावतिव्याप्तिमाशङ्क्य निरस्यते इति सङ्गतिः । यतो वा इत्यादिवाक्योक्तं जगत्कारणत्वं विष्णोरन्यस्यापि वेति सन्देहः । अन्यस्यापीति पूर्वः पक्षः । अनुमानेन रुद्रादावपि जगत्कारणत्वस्य सुसाध्यत्वात् । तथाहि क्षित्यादिकं सकर्तृकं कार्यत्वात् घटवदित्यनुमानेन सिद्धावपि तस्यानुमानस्य नावेदविदिति स्वप्रामाण्यनिषेधकश्रुत्युक्ते विष्णवाख्ये कर्तर्यपर्यवसानेन पाशुपताद्यागमोक्ते शिवादिरूपकर्तर्येव पर्यवसानाद्वा शिवो जगज्जन्मादिकर्ता सर्वज्ञत्वात्, व्यतिरेकेण कुलालवदित्यनुमानेन शिवादिकारणत्वसिद्धिः । न च सर्वज्ञत्वमप्रसिद्धम् । पाशुपताद्यागमेन तत्सिद्धेरित्यागमसहायानुमानावलम्बेन वा

A doubt on whether the aforesaid unique qualities of *Vishnu* find a place in *Rudra* etc is cleared in this chapter. Whether the qualities of universal creation etc as expressed in the text of *upanishat* “*yato vaa* etc” are exclusively found in *Vishnu* or are they found even in others is the question.

Poorvapaksha – The referred qualities are found even in others. The same can be deduced to exist in *Rudra* etc through *anumaana* (logical derivation) – Earth has a creator, for it is a creation, as in the case of pot etc. This decides on the existence of a creator. Now that *veda* itself denies validity of *anumaana* in general in the matter of knowing *Vishnu*, no *anumaana* can lead to understanding *Vishnu* as a creator. Hence by relaying on *paashupaata aagama*, we can conclude that *Shiva* is the creator etc. Even *anumaana* is in favour of such a conclusion – *Shiva* is the creator etc, for he is omniscient. Conversely, like a potter etc. It cannot be said that *Shiva*’s omniscience is not proved. *Paashupaata aagama* stands in evidence for it. Thus, supported by *aagama*, the aforesaid *anumaana* gets stronger to confirm the existence of qualities of being universal creator in *Shiva*.

कार्यत्वाद्यनुमानेन वा नित्यज्ञानेच्छाप्रयत्न(मात्र)वतो नित्यप्रयत्न(मात्र)वतो वा कर्तुः सिद्धेः । तस्य च सिद्धान्तिना विष्णुत्वानङ्गीकारात् संहर्तृत्वादिना रुद्रादिशब्दोक्ते तस्मिन्नेव पर्यवसानमिति केवलानुमानावलम्बेन वा एकः पूर्वः पक्षः । न चात्र विष्णुकारणत्वे परोदाहृतश्रुतिविरोधः । तासामुक्तानुमानविरोधेन विष्णुकारणतामात्रपरत्वादिति ।

A derivation “Earth etc have a creator, for they have an origin. Which ever has an origin, has a creator as in the case of a pot” decides the existence of a creator for the universe. Similarly, another derivation “There is some creator for the universe, for he possesses the qualities of eternal knowledge, desire and effort. One who has these three qualities of knowledge, desire and effort is a creator like a potter” also proves the existence of a creator. A variant of this could be just “effort” instead of “knowledge, desire and effort” as the reasoning. This creator cannot be *Vishnu* for, the opposite party does not agree to him having only three qualities. *Vishnu* is considered to possess innumerable qualities, not just

three. In the case of *Rudra*, this fits in well. He is called *Rudra*, for he makes all cry – meaning, he destroys them all. He is called *shankara*, for he protects all. He is called *bhava*, for he creates all. Similarly, even with logical derivation it can be deduced that *Rudra* is the universal creator etc as seen above.

There is no conflict for the above with the evidences like “*eko daadhaara*”, “*na te mahitvam*”, “*yo nah pita*” that speak of *Vishnu* being creator etc. They contradict the reasoning as detailed above and hence are weak. Moreover, they intend to only convey availability of the referred qualities in *Vishnu* but not to deny them in others.

अपरस्तु । सर्वज्ञशिवादिप्रणीततया अनाशङ्कितदोषेण पाशुपताद्यागमेन रुद्रादेरपि जगत्कारणत्वप्रतीतेः रुद्रादिर्जगत्कर्ता । नचापौरुषेयत्वेन स्वतःप्रामाण्यकेन वेदेन विष्णोरपि जगत्कारणत्वप्रतीतेस्तद्विरोधः । द्वयोरपि कालादिभेदेन कर्तृत्वस्याविरोधात् । वेदे आगमे चेदं सर्वमसृजतेति विष्णवादेः सर्वकर्तृत्वोक्तेः तत्तत्कालसृज्यसर्वपरत्वेन योग्यतापरत्वेन वा उपपत्तेः । वेदे शिवस्य आगमे च विष्णोः कारणतानिषेधस्य उदितहोमादिनिन्दायाः अनुदितहोमादिस्तुति-परत्वमिव विष्णवादिकर्तृताविधिपरत्वसम्भवात् इत्यागमावलम्बी । एवं च सर्वजगज्जन्मादिकर्तृत्वं लक्षणं चेदसम्भवः कतिपयकर्तृत्वं चेदतिव्याप्तिरिति न लक्षणं युक्तमिति पूर्वपक्षफलम् ।

Another says – There is no scope for any doubt in the contents of the books written by *Shiva* etc since they are omniscients. These books like *paashupata agama* speak of *Rudra* etc as the creators of the universe. Hence, it stands proved that *Rudra* etc are the creators of the universe. Now that this contradicts what is told in *vedas*, which are considered as inherently authentic, we need not be concerned. Both are true depending on the time of their reference. While *Vishnu* as described in *vedas* is the creator during one period, *Rudra* is so during a different period. Though *veda* and

the *aagama* speak of creation of “everything”, that would still fit in as *Vishnu*, *Rudra* etc are considered creators of everything during their respective periods. The word “everything” can also be meant to consider everything that they are capable of to remove the contradiction.

There is one more hurdle in the above – *Veda* denies *shiva* being a creator and *aagama* does it so for *Vishnu*. This can be resolved by treating such statements as meant to appreciate the creations by *Vishnu* and *Rudra* and not really intended to negate it for others. Similar expression can be seen in the case of *yajna* where some *homas* are deplored by name only to appreciate those that are not named. The rule there is “*na hi nindaa anindyam ninditum pravartate, api tu vidheyam stotum* – criticizing the one that does not deserve to be deplored is not intended at discrediting it but is intended to appreciate the other one that is being recommended”.

Thus if *Hari* is defined as the creator of the entire universe, the definition is faulty by “*asambhava* – does not fit in the target” and if he is considered as the creator of a section of the universe, the definition fails by the defect of “*ativyaapti* – goes beyond the target”. Hence the definition should be discarded.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ चक्षुरादेः रसगन्धादाविवोक्तानां अवेदमूलानुमानानां “नावेदविन्मनुतेदं बृहन्तं” “औपनिषदः पुरुषः” इत्यादिश्रुत्या जगत्कारणे प्रामाण्यनिषेधात् शशादीनां विषाणित्वादावपि प्रयोक्तुं शक्यत्वेन अतिप्रसक्त्या अर्थासाधकत्वात् आद्यः पूर्वपक्षो न युक्तः । तथा प्रमाणत्वेनाङ्गीकृत-श्रुतिपरिगृहीतया ऋग्यजुस्सामाथर्वाश्च भारतं पञ्चरात्रकमित्यादिस्मृत्या दुरागमाप्रामाण्यस्य उक्तत्वादागमावलम्ब्यपि नेति विष्णोरेव जगत्कारणत्वम् । अतो लक्षणं नातिव्याप्तमिति सिद्धान्ते फलम् । स्मृतिनयादगतार्थत्वमस्य तत्रैव वक्ष्यते । अत्र पूर्वपक्षद्वयं यथाक्रमं भाष्यानुव्याख्यानमूलमिति बोध्यम् ॥ ३ ॥

The way eyes cannot decide on the existence of taste and odor, *anumaana*, the logical derivation cannot be a tool in the matter of God etc in the absence of a supporting text from *vedas*. *Vedas* describe him as the one who cannot be known by those who have not read *vedas*. Another vedic text says *Purusha* (God) can be known only through *vedas*. An unsupported logic can be used even to conclude absurd things like the presence of horns for a rabbit. Hence the first contention of the *poorvapaksha* is invalid.

Vedas, that are considered as inherently authentic and other *smritis* (authored texts) also consider only the following as authentic – *Rigveda*, *yajurveda*, *saamaveda*, *atharvaveda*, *bhaaratam*, *pancharaatra aagama*. Hence anything that contradicts the above are invalid and as such cannot oppose the fact of *Vishnu* being the universal creator etc. Thus, *Vishnu* alone is the universal creator and there is no scope for the defects of *asambhava* or *ativyaapti* as contended.

In a future chapter “*smrityanavakaasha ..*”, one more aspect in the above matter is discussed. It will be elaborated at that place.

The two versions of *poorvapaksha* are taken from *bhaashya* and *anuvyaakhyana* respectively.

॥ ॐ तत्तु समन्वयात् ॐ ॥ ४ ॥

tattu samanvayaat - 4

कारणत्वस्य शास्त्रैकसमदधिगम्यत्वान्नातिव्याप्तिरिति पूर्वाधिकरणफलाक्षेपाद्वा पूर्वाधिकरणसिद्धं कारणत्वेन शास्त्रगम्यत्वं विष्णोरन्यस्य वेति विशेषविचाराद्वा अनन्तरसङ्गतिः । अत्र शास्त्रयोनित्वं विष्णोरेवान्यस्यापि वेति सन्देहः । रुद्रादेरपि कारणत्वेन शास्त्रैकसमदधिगम्यत्वमिति पूर्वः पक्षः । शैवाद्यागमाद्वेदव्याख्यानरूपान्मानन्तराविरुद्धात् रुद्रादेरपि कारणत्वे वेदस्य

तात्पर्यनिश्चयात् । काव्यव्याख्यानादिव काव्यस्य, व्याख्यानतो विशेषप्रतिपत्तिरित्युक्तेः । न च तस्याप्रामाण्यमुक्तमिति वाच्यम् । प्रमाणभूतव्याख्येय-व्याख्यानप्रामाण्ये मानान्तराविरोधे हेत्वन्तरापेक्षाभावात् । इह च मानान्तराविरोधः नैषा तर्केणेत्यादिना सिद्धः । न चैवं पञ्चरात्रादिना विष्णोरपि कारणत्वे वेदतात्पर्यनिश्चयापत्तिः । तथापि देशादिभेदेन पूर्वोक्तदिशा कारणत्वोपपत्त्या विष्णुरेव कर्तेत्यस्य असिद्धेः । उपक्रमादीनां बलाबलनिर्णयायोगेन वेदतात्पर्यानिश्चायकत्वात् इत्येको न्यायविवरणोक्तः ।

The conclusion that the identifying qualities of God, in the form of creation etc of the universe, are knowable only through *shastra* – *vedas* etc is challenged in this chapter. This chapter also discusses whether *Vishnu* alone is the one who can be known through *vedas* or that others are also as such.

Whether *shastrayonitvam* – knowable only through *vedas* is an unique attribute of *Vishnu* or that the said quality is available in others also is the question.

Poorvapaksha – Even others like *Rudra* have this quality of being known as the creator through *vedas*. The texts like *shaiva-aagama* etc that are in the nature of commentaries of *Veda* speak of *Rudra* etc as the creators and they have no contradiction from other evidences. Hence the intent of *vedas* is known to be in favour of considering *Rudra* etc as the creators. This is similar to the commentary on a poem that brings to the fore, the intent of the poem. It is said “*vyaakhyanato vishesha pratipattih* – the commentary enables a better understanding”. It cannot also be said that the commentary itself is improper (as described in the previous chapter where all arguments that do not follow *vedas* are declared as invalid). If the original text is authentic and its commentary has no evidences to the contrary, the commentary is considered as authentic by default. It does not need something else to

authenticate. In the present case, the absence of a contrary evidence is proved by the vedic text “*naishaa tarkena* – He cannot be understood by logic”. It cannot be said that going by this statement, even *Vishnu* is considered by *vedas* as the universal creator etc. It is possible to interpret that *Vishnu* has also been the creator etc during different periods or for different places. Thus, it is not proper to say that he alone has been the creator.

The argument that the intent of *vedas* can be decided by applying the rules of interpretation like *upakrama*, *upasamhaara* is also not valid, since it is not clear as to which one is strong amongst them and how to handle contradictions within the said indicators of *upakrama* etc.

अन्यस्तु वेदादिशास्त्राद् रुद्रादेः कारणत्वं तावद्भवति । तत्र शास्त्रतात्पर्यं च अबाधादेव सिद्धम् । न च विष्णोः कारणत्वसाधकं रुद्रादेस्तन्निषेधकं वाक्यमेव बाधकम् । वैपरीत्यस्यापि सम्भवेन द्वयोस्तुल्यबलतया द्वयोरपि कर्तृत्वेन कालादिभेदेन विष्णोः कारणत्वस्य रुद्रादेस्तदभावस्य च प्रतिपादनेन तद्वाक्यस्योपपत्तेरिति वेदजन्यापातप्रतीत्यवलम्बी भाष्योक्तः । यद्वा शैवाद्यागमस्याप्रामाण्योक्त्या न वेदतात्पर्यनिर्णायकत्वमिति वाच्यम् । वेदेऽपि रुद्रादेः कारणत्वप्रतीतेरिति आपातप्रतीतिसध्रीचीनागमावलम्ब्येक एव पूर्वः पक्षः । अत्र द्वौ पूर्वपक्षाविति आद्यकल्पः सुधाभिमतः अन्त्यष्टीकाभिमतः ।

Another person puts forth his argument – It gets known from *veda* and other texts that *Rudra* etc are the creators of the universe. The intent of such texts is clear by the mere fact that they have nothing contrary in evidence. The statements in favor of *Vishnu* being the creator and specifically negating *Rudra* etc as such cause no harm. For, it can also be said the very statements depicting *Rudra* etc as creators are invalidating those in favor of *vishnu*. Thus both stand equally positioned. Since both the statements are of equal strength, it should be understood that during the period when *Vishnu* has been the creator, *Rudra* was not and when *Rudra* has been the

creator *Vishnu* was not. These arguments are as described in *Bhaashya* based on the apparent meaning of *vedic* texts.

Another argument is, by telling that *shaiva-aagama* etc as unauthentic, the intention of *Vedas* does not get decided. For, even in *vedas*, there are several texts that speak of *Rudra* etc as the creators. Thus, this argument is based on the apparent meaning of the *vedic* texts supported by other texts like *shaiva-aagama*.

The initial two *poorvapaksha* arguments are picked from *Nyaaya Sudha* and the last one from *Tatvaprapakaashika*.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ वेदे परस्परमापाततो विरोधप्रतीतेरेकवाक्यत्वसिद्धये तात्पर्येऽवश्यं निश्चये शैवाद्यागमस्योक्तरीत्याऽप्रामाण्यात् मानान्तराविरुद्धेऽपि उपक्रमाद्यननुगुणे आपातप्रतीतेऽर्थे तात्पर्यानिर्णायकत्वेन च तद्व्याख्यान-त्वायोगात्, आपातप्रतीतेश्च अज्ञानमूलत्वेनानिर्णायकत्वात् व्याख्यानस्यापि उपक्रमादिभिरेव तात्पर्यं निश्चित्य तेन वेदतात्पर्यस्य निश्चेतव्यत्वेनावश्यकैरुप-क्रमादिभिरेव मूलग्रन्थेषूक्तरीत्या सुशकबलाबलनिर्णयैर्वेदतात्पर्यस्य निश्चेतव्यत्वेन तैर्विष्णुरेव जगत्कारणत्वेन मुख्यतोऽशेषसच्छास्त्रतात्पर्यविषय इति सिध्यतीति आगमावलम्बी प्रतीत्यवलम्बी चेति द्वावपि पूर्वपक्षावयुक्तौ । अतएवान्त्योऽप्ययुक्त इति लक्षणं नातिव्याप्तमिति फलम् ॥ ४ ॥

When the apparent meanings of *vedic* text contradict each other, in order to find their commonness, we need to look for the intent of such texts. On doing so, the *aagamas* (texts) of *shaiva* etc get proved to be unauthentic and also as contradicting other evidential texts. Where the apparent meanings are not in accordance with the rules of interpretation viz., *upakrama* etc., then they should not be construed and described as the intent of such texts. In such cases, the apparent meaning is based on the reader's ignorance. The commentators should also consider the rules of interpretation and extract the true meaning ignoring the apparent meaning before they

provide their commentary. While so doing, the inter se strength of the parameters of *upakrama*, *upasamhaara*, *abhyaasa*, *apoorvata*, *phalam*, *arthavaada* and *upapatti* need to be weighed and applied to extract the true meaning. When so done, it gets decided that the entire of *shastra* (*veda* and other texts) speak of only *Vishnu* as the universal creator etc.

Thus the two *poorvapakshas* based on the texts and on the apparent meanings stand repudiated. It is for the same reason, even the last one is incorrect. Hence the attribute of being the cause of universe etc for *Vishnu* has no violations.

॥ ॐ ईक्षतेर्नाशब्दम् ॐ ॥ ५ ॥

eeekshater-naashabdam – 5

॥ ॐ गौणश्चेन्नात्मशब्दात् ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ तन्निष्ठस्य मोक्षोपदेशात् ॐ ॥

॥ ॐ हेयत्वावचनाच्च ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ स्वाप्ययात् ॐ ॥

॥ ॐ गतिसामान्यात् ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ श्रुतत्वाच्च ॐ ॥

*gounashchenna-aatmashabdaat; tannishtasya mokshopadeshaat; heyatva-
avachanaaccha; svaapyayaat
gati-saamaanyaat; shrutatvaaccha*

मुख्यवृत्त्या सर्वशास्त्रतात्पर्यविषयो ब्रह्मेति पूर्वोक्ताक्षेपेण पूर्वपक्षोत्थानादाक्षेपिकी सङ्गतिः । मुख्यतः सर्वशास्त्रयोनित्वं ब्रह्मणो युक्तं न वेति सन्देहः । न युक्तमिति प्राप्तम् । यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते (ते. २-४-१) इत्यादिश्रुतिभिः तस्यावाच्यत्वोक्तेः । न च पुरिशयं पुरुषमीक्षते (ष. प्र. ५-५) इति ब्रह्मणः ईक्षणीयत्वोक्तेः औपनिषदस्य च शब्देतरेणेक्षणायोगात् शब्देनेक्षणं वाच्यत्वं विना अयुक्तमिति वाच्यम् । ईक्षणश्रुतेर्गौणात्मपरत्वात् तस्य च वाच्यत्वात् शुद्धात्मनोऽप्यवाच्यस्य लक्षणया शब्देनेक्षणोपपत्तेश्च “अवचनेनैव प्रोवाच” इति श्रुतेर्वचनवृत्तिं विना लक्षणयोपदिदेशेत्यर्थात् । न च लक्षणापक्षे किमस्य पदस्य लक्ष्यमिति प्रश्नेऽवाच्ये लक्षकपदान्तर एव प्रयोक्तव्ये तदर्थं वाच्यसम्बन्धितया ज्ञानस्यापेक्षितत्वात्तदर्थं लक्षकान्तरपदप्रयोगेऽनवस्थेति वाच्यम् ।

वाच्यत्वपक्षेऽपि वाचकस्य गृहीतसम्बन्धस्यैव बोधकत्वात् सम्बन्धग्रहस्य च सम्बन्धिग्रहाधीनत्वात् सम्बन्धिनो ब्रह्मण औपनिषदत्वाच्छास्त्रान्तरेणैव तद्बोध इत्यनवस्थातौल्यान्मुख्यवृत्त्येत्युक्तम्। यदपि सर्वशास्त्रयोनित्वं ब्रह्मण इति तदपि न । अनन्ता वै वेदा इति श्रुतेर्वेदानामानन्त्येन स्वल्पायुर्ज्ञानादियुतैः परुषैरनन्तवेदस्वरूपस्यैव दुर्ग्रहत्वेन सर्वशास्त्रं ब्रह्मपरमित्यस्य दुर्ज्ञानत्वादिति पूर्वः पक्षः ।

This chapter questions the conclusion of the previous chapter that *Brahma* alone is the primary address of the entire of *shastra*.

Whether or not it is proper to consider that *Brahma* is knowable through all the texts of *shastra* is the primary question. *Poorvapaksha* says it is not proper. The vedic texts like “*yato vaacho nivartante*” specifically mention that *Brahma* cannot be known through words.

It is true that the vedic text “*purishayam purusham eekshate* – one would see that *Purusha* (*Brahma*) who is dwelling in *pura*, the bodies of living beings” indicates his visibility. A visibility through *upanishats* would only mean that he can be known through words. However, this text speaks of *gouna-aatma* and such an *aatma* is certainly knowable. *Shuddha-aatma* can also be considered as knowable through words in their secondary sense (*lakshana*). This is like calling a boy as fire. Boy is certainly not fire but is called so because of his brilliance. This secondary reference also suits in the context of *Brahma* being called as knowable in view of the vedic statement “*avachanenaiva provaacha* – spoke of him without words (that speak of him directly)”.

This type of *lakshana* expression expects a primary address for the words while it secondarily refers to something else. If the words like “*Brahma*” does not address him primarily, we should know

by what name he is known. In the referred example, the word “fire” does not primarily address the boy. However it is the word “boy” that makes us know whom the word “fire” is addressing in the secondary sense. In the present case, there should be some word that makes us know the subject, whom the word “*Brahma*” is addressing in the secondary sense. We should take some name, like the word “boy” in the illustration. Such name also would be addressing him only in the secondary sense since he is considered as not knowable through words in their primary sense. Then the question repeats as to whom such second name is addressing in the secondary sense and it goes on. This type of an open chain is called the defect of *anavasthaa*. *Poorvapaksha* says, this should not be counted as a defect. For, even where the words are used in the primary sense, a situation of similar kind will arise. When a word is said to address an object, there is a relationship between these two – *vaachya-vaachaka sambandha*. It is only when a person knows this relationship between the name and its target object that he can understand what is spoken of. To know any relationship, one has to know the things that are related. That means he should be knowing “*Brahma*” before he could understand the relationship between the word and the person. To know *Brahma*, he should refer again to some vedic text, for *Brahma* can be known only through *shaashtra*. There again, the words describing him can communicate only to a person who knows the relationship between such words and *Brahma*. And this goes on.

This apart, it is not true that all words of *shaashtra* speak of *Brahma*. It is said that the vedic texts are innumerable. Humans have limited knowledge and life. They cannot even comprehend the innumerability of vedic texts. How can they know that all such texts speak of only *Brahma*? Impossible.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ "आत्मन्येवात्मानं पश्येत्" (बृ.६-४-२३) "यस्यानुवित्तः प्रतिबुद्ध आत्मा तस्य लोकः स उ लोक एव" (बृ.६-४-१३) इत्यादौ ईक्षणीयस्य आत्मशब्दतन्निष्ठमोक्षोपदेशादिभिः शुद्धात्मत्वात् तस्य च लक्षणयेक्षणीयत्वे प्रागुक्तानवस्थानात् । स्वप्रकाशतया नित्यसिद्धे लक्षणेत्यस्य शास्त्रवैयर्थ्यापातेनायोगात् वाच्यत्वपक्षे यौगिकपदानां वाक्यतुल्यतया पृथक् सङ्गतिग्रहानपक्षत्वेन अनवस्थाभावात्, यतो वाच इत्यादिश्रुतेः साकल्येन वागविषयत्वेनोपपत्तेः । वेदानामानन्त्येऽपि "सर्वे वेदा युक्तयः" इति गतिसामान्यश्रवणात् सर्वज्ञसूत्रकृन्निर्णीतार्थकशाखादृष्टान्तेन शाखान्तरेऽपि शाखात्वहेतुनैतदर्थकत्वस्यैवानुमानादवगमात् मुख्यतः सर्वशास्त्रयोनित्वं विष्णोर्युक्तमिति फलं स्पष्टम् ॥ अर्थद्वयसमर्थनार्थत्वेऽपि एकसंशब्दार्थसाधनार्थत्वादधिकरणैक्यं ध्येयम् ॥ ५ ॥

The words that speak of *brahma* do so in their primary sense and not in their secondary sense. The texts "*aatmanyeva aatmaanam pashyet* – one should see *aatma* in ones own self", "one who has known *aatma* begets the world of *aatma*" etc speak of *shuddha-aatma* alone and not *gouna-aatma* as contended by the *poorvapaksha*. Had the words been considered as primarily addressing *gouna-aatma*, we would have encountered the defect of *anavastha*. Not when *shuddha-aatma* is considered as the target. If it is to be understood that the words speak of him only in the secondary sense since he is "*swaprakaasha* – known by his own", the entire of *shastra* would go waste. The contention that the relationship between the words and their target objects can be understood only when the word and objects are known is also not true. For, the words have an etymological meaning and thus are in the nature of sentences describing the object they address. As such they do not require a prior knowledge of the object. Hence there is no defect of *anavastha*. The vedic texts "*yato vaacho nivartante*" only negate a complete understanding of God through words. They do not negate every description of him. Though vedic texts are

innumerable, they all speak in harmony. The *Paingee* text of vedas explains the fact that all vedic texts and maxims are authentic and speak of only *Brahma*. They have no contradictions amongst them. This intent can also be derived through logic that all vedic texts have no contradictions with other branches of vedas, since they are all branches of the same veda, as is seen in those texts that have been discussed and decided by the omniscient *Vedavyasa* sage in *brahma sootras*.

Hence it is valid to say that the entire of *shastra* speaks of *Vishnu*.

सर्वे वेदा यत्पदमामनन्तीति (कठ. १-२-१५) श्रुत्यक्तस्यापि समन्वयस्य बाधकोद्धारादिना स्थापनार्थमयमध्यायशेषः सफलः । अत्र समन्वयसूत्रप्रतिज्ञातसमन्वयहेतौ वाच्यत्वे ईक्षतिनयोक्ते अध्यायशेषेण प्रतिज्ञातसमन्वय उपपाद्यते । वैदिकशब्दानां तत्रान्यत्रोभयत्रान्यत्रैव प्रसिद्धभेदेन चतुर्विधानां मध्ये ब्रह्मणि प्रसिद्धानां समन्वयस्यावक्तव्यात् । इतरेषां च नामलिङ्गभेदेन प्रत्येकं द्वैविध्यान्महामल्लभङ्गन्यायेन आदावन्यत्रप्रसिद्धस्य तत्रापि साक्षाद्धर्मिवाचित्वेन प्राधान्यादाद्ये पादे नाम्नः, धर्मद्वारा धर्मिबोधकलिङ्गानां द्वितीयपादे, उभयत्र प्रसिद्धानां द्विविधानामपि तृतीये समन्वयः । अन्यत्रैव प्रसिद्धशब्दसमन्वयस्य महाप्रयत्नसाध्यत्वेऽप्यसर्वाधिकारिकतया प्रथमं दुर्बोधतया चान्त्ये तत्समन्वय उच्यत इति पादानां भेदः क्रमश्च । अन्यत्रप्रसिद्धादीनामसाङ्कर्यं रूढयौगिकतया नामलिङ्गभेद इत्यादि चन्द्रिकातोऽवसेयम् ॥

The purpose of the balance of this division lies in justifying the vedic statement that all vedas describe Him by discussing the counter points for it. While the chapter “*eeekshater naashabdam*” justifies a discussion mandated in the *sootra* “*tat tu samanvayaat*”, the remaining chapters here are oriented towards explaining how all the vedic words speak of God alone.

All the vedic words can be classified into four categories based on their usage, viz. Those that speak of God, those that speak of others, those that speak of God as well as others and those that speak of others only. There is no need to explain the first category since they are already known to be speaking of God. Others are again of two types, viz. Names and attributes. In a fight if the strongest opponent is tackled first, handling others would be smooth. Similarly here. The strong objections in orienting all the words towards God is from those that speak of others and that too directly. Hence the synchronization of names is taken up in this section. Those that speak of others through their attributes are taken up in the second section. The words that are popular both in others and God, be they names or attributes, are taken up in the third section and in the last section, synchronization of those words – names or attributes, that are popular only in others are taken up in the last section of this division. In fact, this is the toughest part. Going by the argument that the strong one should be tackled first, this should have been taken up first. However, this is tough to be understood by all. Hence taken up at the end, after the base is set in the previous sections for ease of understanding.

There are some apparent admixtures. Their clarifications are done based on their usage and etymological meanings, names and attributes etc can be known from the book *Tatparya Chandrika* of Sri Vyaasyateertha swamiji.

॥ ॐ आनन्दमयोऽभ्यासात् ॐ ॥ ६ ॥

Aanandamayo abhyaasaat – 6

॥ ॐ विकारशब्दान्नेति चेन्न प्राचुर्यात् ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ तद्धेतुव्यपदेशाच्च ॐ ॥

॥ ॐ मान्त्रवर्णिकमेव च गीयते ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ नेतरोऽनुपपत्तेः ॐ ॥

॥ ॐ भेदव्यपदेशाच्च ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ कामाच्च नानुमानापेक्षा ॐ ॥

॥ ॐ अस्मिन्नस्य च तद्योगं शास्ति ॐ ॥

*vikaara-shabdaan-neti chenna praachuryaat; tadhetu-vyapadeshaaccha;
maantra-varnikameva cha geeyate; netato anupapatteh; bheda-
vyapadeshaaccha; kaamaaccha naanumaana-apekshaa;*

सर्वपेक्षितानन्दप्रदोपासनाविषयपूर्णानन्दत्वरूपमहागुणस्य प्रथमं वाच्यत्वाद्वा, आत्मशब्दाद्गौणात्मनिरासः प्रागुक्तोऽयुक्तः तस्य अब्रह्मणि गौणात्मन्यानन्दमयादौ एतमानन्दमयमात्मानमिति श्रवणादिति पूर्वोक्ताक्षेपेण पूर्वपक्षप्रवृत्तेः आक्षेपिकी वा सङ्गतिः । तैत्तिरीये स वा एष पुरुषोऽन्नरसमय (तै. २-४) इत्यादिना श्रुताः गुणिसामान्यवाचकाः अन्नमयप्राणमयमनोमयविज्ञानमयानन्दमयशब्दाः आनन्दविज्ञानादिगुणसामान्यवाचकाः विषयः । तदर्थं किं चतुर्मुखादिर्विष्ण्वन्यः कश्चिदुत विष्णुरिति सन्देहः । विष्णोरन्य इति पूर्वः पक्षः ॥

Everybody desires *aananda*, pleasure at all times. This can be had by doing *upaasana* (meditation in gross terms) of the great quality of God that describes him as *poorna-ananda*. Hence this is taken up at the first instance. There is another reason for taking up this topic at this stage – raising an objection on the conclusion in the previous chapter that the word “*aatma*” refers to *Brahma* and not others. The objection is based on the vedic text “*etam aanandamayam aatmaanam*”. In the *taittireeya* branch of vedas it is said “*sa vaa esha purusho annarasamayah*” etc. These expressions speak of some one who is *annamaya*, *praanamaya*, *manomaya*, *vijnaanamaya* and *aanandamaya*. These words that describe the respective qualities are the subject of discussion here. Whether the person described with these words is someone other than *Vishnu* like *Chaturmukha* or *Vishnu* is the question. The *poorvapaksha* says it is someone other than *Vishnu*.

तथाहि । अन्नमयादीनां विकारार्थकमयत्प्रत्यययुक्तत्वात् ब्रह्मणश्च निर्विकारोऽक्षरः शुद्ध इत्युक्त्या निर्विकारत्वात् तदनभिमानित्वाच्च, प्राचुर्यार्थत्वेऽपि तस्य विजातीयाल्पत्वनिरूप्यत्वेन ब्रह्मणि दुःखादिलेशप्रसक्त्या

तदयोगात् तादात्म्यार्थस्य मयटो वैयर्थ्यं पराहतत्वात् अन्नात्पुरुष (तै. २-३)
 इति अन्नविकारं पुरुषशब्दोक्तं देहं प्रकृत्य स वा एष पुरुषोऽन्नरसमय
 इत्युक्तत्वात् तस्येदमेव शिरः अयं दक्षिणः पक्षः अयमुत्तरः पक्षः अयमात्मा इदं
 पुच्छं प्रतिष्ठेति शिरोबाह्याद्यवयवानां प्रत्यक्षत्वेन निर्देशाच्च अन्नमये मयटः
 विकारार्थत्वेऽवश्यंभाविनि द्वैविध्यायोगेन सर्वत्र विकारार्थत्वस्यैव न्याय्यत्वाच्च ।
 किञ्च अन्योऽन्तर आत्मा प्राणमय इत्यादिनैतेऽन्यान्यत्वादिना तस्यैष एव शारीर
 आत्मेति शरीरशरीरिभावेन चोच्यन्ते, एते च पञ्च कोशाः ब्रह्म तु
 एकमेवाद्वितीयमित्यादेः निर्भेदमेकं च, अशरीरः प्रज्ञात्मेत्युक्तेरशरीरं च,
 आनन्दमये च तस्य प्रियमेव शिरः मोदो दक्षिणः पक्षः प्रमोद उत्तरः पक्षः
 आनन्द आत्मा ब्रह्म पुच्छं प्रतिष्ठेति ब्रह्मण आनन्दमयपादाख्यावयवतयोक्तेः
 आनन्दमयो न ब्रह्म द्वयोर्ब्रह्मत्वविरोधात्, अवयवावयविनोरैक्यायोगात् । तस्मात्
 कोशा एव वा, सर्वविकारात्मत्वेन प्रकृतिर्वा, विकाराभिमानित्वात् लक्ष्मीर्वा,
 जीवो वा अन्यो वा यः कश्चिद्वाप्योक्तदिशा एतैः शब्देरुच्यते । न सर्वथा
 विष्णुरिति ॥

Poorvapaksha – The “*maya(t)*” suffix in the words “*annamaya*”
 etc generally indicates the existence of a *vikaara*, change –
 something made of *anna* etc. *Brahma* (*Vishnu*) who is described as
 “*nirvikaarah* – immutable”, “*aksharah* – one who does not have
 any loss” and “*shuddhah* – flawless”, is without any change and is
 not even responsible for mutations. Another meaning of the suffix
 “*maya*” is “*praachurya* – abundance”. Even this meaning does not
 suit *Brahma*, for if we say *Brahma* has *aananda* (pleasure) in
 abundance, it implies that he has some pain as well, though not in
 significant proportions. *Brahma* does not have even a speck of
 pain. The third meaning of the suffix “*maya*” is oneness – i.e.,
Brahma himself is *anna* etc. This meaning would make the suffix
 “*maya*” redundant, as even without it the words “*anna*” etc would
 have communicated oneness.

This apart, the statements “*annaat purushah – purusha* is born to *anna*” refer to *purusha*, the body that is built out of *anna*, the food. The script goes further stating that the body referred to as *purusha* is a derivative of the essence of food and is made of a head, the right arm, the left arm, the torso and the bottom portion (legs) and while doing so, it says “this is the head” etc indicating that it is referring to what is physically visible. This has to be the body. Thus with the usage of suffix “*maya*” confirming it to mean a derivative, a different meaning cannot be adopted to other qualities like “*praanamaya*”.

Another factor is, the vedic text explains “*praanamaya*” as “*anya – different*” from “*annamaya*” and says that *praanamaya* is inside *annamaya* and that *annamaya* is the body for *praanamaya*. Similarly others – *praanamaya* is the body for *manomaya*, *manomaya* is the body for *vijnaanamaya* and *vijnaanamaya* is the body for *aanandamaya*. Thus, these are five different layers. *Brahma* however is a single entity – *ekameva advitiyaam*. He does not have any multiplicity within him. He is described as *ashareerah prajnaatma* – the one who does not have a body and an embodiment of knowledge. Hence he does not have a body.

The *aanandamaya* layer is described as having “*priya – the pleasure derived on hearing a pleasant news*” as his head, “*modah – the pleasure on seeing something desired*” as his right arm, “*pramodah – the pleasure derived on consuming the desired*” as his left arm, “*aananda – the inherent pleasure*” as the torso and “*brahma*” as his tail piece – legs. Thus, *Brahma* is described as legs - a component of *aanandamaya*. Hence *aanandamaya* cannot be *Brahma*. Both *aanandamaya* and his tail piece cannot be *Brahma*. A component cannot be considered as one with the whole as well. Hence the words “*annamaya*” etc refer to the layers only. Since they are described as derivatives of another, they could be

referring to *prakriti*, the “matter” or goddess *Lakshmi* who is the *abhimaani* (regulating deity) of *prakriti*. They could even be referring to *jeeva* or someone else as explained in *Bhaashya*. On no count they could be referring to *Brahma*.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ अन्नमयादयः पञ्चापि ब्रह्मैव येऽन्नं ब्रह्मोपासते ये प्राणं ब्रह्मोपासते आनन्दं ब्रह्मणो विद्वान् विज्ञानं ब्रह्म चेद्वेद अस्ति ब्रह्मेति चेद्वेद इति पञ्चस्वपि प्रत्येकं ब्रह्मशब्दश्रवणात् विज्ञानानन्दमयोस्तदभ्यासाच्च । अन्योऽन्तर आत्मा प्राणमयः एतमन्नमयमात्मानमित्येवंरूपेण पञ्चस्वप्यात्मशब्दाभ्यासाच्च । तथान्नमये अद्यतेऽस्ति च भूतानीत्यादिना सर्वोपजीव्यत्वसर्वसंहतृत्वज्येष्ठत्वोपासकप्राप्यत्वादिलिङ्गम् । प्राणमये च प्राणं देवा अनुप्राणन्तीत्यादिना सर्वदेवादिचेष्टकत्वं सर्वयूरूपमोक्षहेतुज्ञानविषयत्वमित्यपि लिङ्गम् । मनोमये च यतो वाचो निवर्तन्त इत्यादिना अवाङ्मनसगोचरत्वभयाभावरूपमुक्तिहेतुवेदनविषयत्वादिलिङ्गम् । विज्ञानमये च विज्ञानं देवाः सर्वे ब्रह्म ज्येष्ठमुपासते इत्यादिना सर्वदेवोपास्यत्वज्येष्ठत्वमुक्तिहेतुत्वोपासकप्राप्यत्वादिलिङ्गम् । आनन्दमये च सोऽकामयतेत्यादिना सङ्कल्पपूर्वकं स्रष्टृत्वं सर्वान्तर्यामित्वं मुक्तिहेतुज्ञानविषयत्वमित्यादिलिङ्गम् । तथा को ह्येवान्यात्कः प्राण्याद्यदेष आकाश आनन्दो न स्यादित्यानन्दशब्दितपूर्णानन्दत्वरूपानन्दमयत्वे विश्वचेष्टकत्वस्य हेतुत्वम् । पञ्चानामपि स य एवं विदित्युक्तब्रह्मविदा एतमन्नमयमात्मानमुपसङ्गामतीति फलत्वेन प्राप्यत्वोक्तेः ब्रह्मवित्प्राप्यत्वं श्रुतमिति पञ्चस्वपि लिङ्गबाहुल्यात् ब्रह्मविदाप्नोतिपरमिति उक्तब्रह्मणि सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्मेति मन्त्रवर्णोक्तलक्षणस्य एतैः शब्दैर्व्याख्यानेन ब्रह्मप्रकरणत्वात् ।

All the five names viz. *annamaya* etc refer to *Brahma* alone. We find the word “*Brahma*” in all the five *mantras* viz. “*ye annam brahmopaasate*” (*anna* as *Brahma*), “*ye praanam brahmopaasate*” (*praana* as *Brahma*), “*aanandam brahmano vidwaan*” (*manah* as *Brahma*), “*vijnaanam brahma ched veda*” (*vijnaana* as *Brahma*) and “*asti brahma ched veda*” (*aananda* as *Brahma*). In the cases of *vijnaanamaya* and *aanandamaya*, the word “*brahma*” occurs more than once, like “*brahma jyeshtamupaasate*” and “*asanneva sa*

bhavati asad brahmeti veda chet". This apart, in all the five cases, we find the word "*aatma*" like "*anyo antaraaatmaa praanamayah*", "*etam annamayam aatmaanam*".

While describing *annamaya*, he is said to be "eaten by all" and that "he eats all". "Eaten by all" means, all are dependent on him for their survival. "He eats all" refers to the killing of all by him (during *pralaya* - deluge). Similarly "*annam hi bhootaanaam jyeshtam*" speaks of him being superior to all, "*athainat apiyantyatah*" speaks of him being the destiny of all. With reference to *praanamaya*, he is described as the regulator of all deities, referred to as "*sarva-aayu*" where the word "*aayu*" is meant as *jnaana*, the knowledge. He is thus the subject of the proper knowledge that leads to *moksha*.

In the case of *manomaya*, he is described as beyond the reach of speech and mind, fearless and the subject matter of that knowledge which leads to *moksha*. In the case of *Vijnaanamaya*, he is described as the one worshiped by all the deities, superior to all, the provider of *moksha*, the one who can be reached through *upaasana*. In the case of *aanandamaya*, he is described, through the words "*sokaamayata*" etc, as the one who created the world just by a thought, one who is staying in everyone and the subject matter of that study which leads to *moksha*.

The reason for him being the regulator and energizer of the entire universe is explained through the words "*ko hyevaanyaat..*" wherein it is said, had this *aakaasha* (here *Vishnu* is called by the name *aakaasha*) not been an embodiment of pleasure, who else could have regulated this universe? In the subsequent part of the *upanishat* that is describing "*annamaya*" etc, it says the one who has known *Brahma* would enter the supreme. Since *annamaya* etc are referred to as *Brahma* as shown earlier, it would mean that the one who has known *annamaya* etc would enter the supreme. This

fact is reinforced with the statements like “*etam annamayam aatmaanam upasankraamati* – he would enter this God known as *annamaya*”.

All these qualities as described for *annamaya* etc are specific to *Vishnu* and they are like descriptions of the qualities of *satyam*, *jnaanam* and *anantam* with which vedas describe *Brahma*. Hence the entire of the discussion in the *upanishat* is on *Brahma* (*brahma prakaranam* – chapter dealing with *Brahma*).

भृगुर्वै वारुणिरित्यादिभृगुवल्लीसमाख्यानात् । शन्नोमित्रादिभिः वाक्यैस्तैरेव हरिस्तुवत् । मुक्तगीतावसानैस्तु स्तुतस्तेन जनार्दन इति स्मृत्या (तै.भा. १-१) ब्रह्मपरत्वेन निणीतोपनिषद्रूपस्थानमध्यपतितत्वाच्च । ब्रह्मात्मशब्दादेर्भाष्योदाहृतश्रुत्यादिभिः विष्णवेकनिष्ठत्वाद्भृगुवल्याः समाख्यानत्वस्य मूलग्रन्थेषु समर्थनात् । न च मयट्प्रत्ययायोगः । तस्य सजातीयजीवगतसुखाल्पत्व-निरूप्यतया प्राचुर्यार्थत्वेनोपपत्तेः । उक्तं च विजातीयसमानाधिकरणाल्पं यथा तथा । सजातीयविभिन्नाधिकरणाल्पं निरूपकमिति ॥ अन्यत्वान्तरत्वाद्युक्तिरपि अधिष्ठानभूतकोशानामन्यत्वादन्तरत्वात् शरीरित्वाद्ब्रह्मणो बहुरुपत्वात् विशेषसत्त्वात् अनन्योऽप्यन्यशब्देनेत्यादिस्मृतिबलाच्च युज्यते ।

This conclusion that the discussion is on *Brahma* and that *aanandamaya* etc speak of him only has a support from the *Bhrigu valli* of the same *taittireeya Upanishat*, where these aspect are explained through a conversation between the sage *Bhrigu* and his father *Varuna*, the deity. This fact is also made clear by another script that says “The text that begins with *shanno mitra* and concludes with the mention of prayers to *Janaardana*, by those who have achieved *moksha* (*etat saama gaayan aaste*) are all in the praise of *Hari*”. The reference of the beginning and end clearly indicates it to be *taittireeya Upanishat* and this is where *annamaya* etc are described. Hence the said names refer to *Brahma* alone. This apart, the scripts quoted in *Bhaashya* make it clear that the

words “*Brahma*” and “*aatma*” mean *Vishnu* alone. The fact that this interpretation is supported by the *bhrigu valli* section of *taittiriya upanishat* is well explained in the original texts (*Sootra Bhaashya* and commentary on the said *upanishat*).

The objection that the suffix “*maya*”, signifying changes does not fit in *Vishnu* is not true. For, the said suffix speaks of the abundance of the referred qualities of pleasure etc in *Vishnu* vis-a-vis that of *Jeevas* who are characterized by the qualities of limited pleasure etc. The script says “The way the higher proportion of one aspect vis-a-vis that of others in the same object signifies the meaning of *maya*, it also does so when it refers to the same aspect being in higher proportion in one object vis-a-vis other objects”.

The expressions “*anya*” (different), “*antara*” (inside) and “*shareeritva*” (having a body) referred to in the *poorvapaksha*, above indicating the fact of *annamaya* etc being different from one another and one sitting inside the other etc, speak of the *koshas* (shells) in which these forms *annamaya*, *manomaya* etc are staying. *Brahma* has many forms and though they are not different from him or amongst themselves, they act like different on account of “*vishesha*” in them. This fact is made clear in the scripts “*ananyopi anya shabdena*” etc and hence have no contradiction.

कथं तर्हि स वा एष इति देहपरामर्श इति चेन्न । आत्मन अकाश इत्यादाव-
न्नात्पुरुष इत्यन्ते वाक्ये हरेरप्याकाशादिनियामकरूपस्य प्रदुर्भावरूपजनेरुक्तेः ।
पुरुषपदेन हरेरपि प्रकृततया तत्परामर्शात् । यद्वक्ष्यति “कारणत्वेन
चाकाशादिषु” इत्यादि (ब्र. सू. १-४-१५) । प्रकृतान्नमयदेहव्यावृत्त्यर्थमेव
रसशब्देन सः इति व्यवहितात्मपरामर्शिना तच्छब्देन च विशेषणात्
अन्यथेषोऽन्नमय इत्येतावता पूर्तेः । तस्येदमेव शिरः इति प्रत्यक्षनिर्देशस्य
वस्त्रप्रावृतजानुनि इदं जान्वितिवदुपपत्तेः । आनन्दमयतदवयवयोर्द्वयोरपि
पूर्णत्वरूपब्रह्मत्वस्य अन्यत्र समर्थनेनावयवत्वविरोधाभावाच्च । अतः

साधकसत्त्वाद्वाधकाभावाच्च पञ्चाप्यनिरुद्धादिब्रह्मरूपाण्येव कोशस्थानीति ।
 प्रयोजनं तु ब्रह्मण आनन्दमयावयवत्वात् अवयविनं
 विनाऽवयवजिज्ञासाऽयोगादिति जिज्ञासाक्षेपसमाधाने ॥ ६ ॥

What then would happen to the usage “*sa vaa esha purusha..* - the same *purusha*” referring to the bodies (by the name *purusha*) if the names *annamaya* etc are referring to the forms of *Brahma*?

[The context here is, the previous statements of the said *upanishat* speaks of *aakasha* taking birth from *aatma*, *vaayu* from *aakaasha*, *agni* from *vaayu*, *aapa* from *agni*, *prithivi* from *agni*, *oshadhee* from *prithivi*, *anna* from *oshadhee* and *purusha* from *anna*. Then it says, the same *purusha* is *annarasamayah* and describes this *annamaya*. If *annamaya* is not to be considered as the physical body, then the entire of referred text speaking of a series of generations would go for a toss].

The answer is, right from the stage “*aatmana aakaasha – aakaasha* taking birth from *aatma*”, up to the stage of “*annaat purushah – purusha* getting birth from *anna*”, even *Hari* (*Vishnu*) moves in the progression with his forms entering *aakaasha* etc to regulate and energize them all. The manifestation of these forms in line with the progression is also termed as births, though they are just manifestations. The word “*purusha*” refers to *Hari* as well and hence the reference to it in “the same *purusha*” refers to *Hari*. In the upcoming *sootra* “*kaaranatvena cha aakaashaadishu..*” this aspect of *Vishnu*’s forms in the name of *aakaasha* etc is explained in detail. The word “*annarasamayah*” instead of “*annamaya*” marks the difference with the inclusion of the component “*rasa*” differentiating it from the physical body. The word “*sa – that*” in “*sa vaa esha purusha*” also hints at a reference to a distant aspect than the immediate preceding one. As otherwise the “*annamayah*” would have sufficed instead of “*annarasamaya*”.

How then do the statements refer to something present in front with the words “*idam* – this”? What is present in front is only the physical body. It is simple. When we say “this thigh” by pointing at the cloth covering the thigh, the word “this” is never understood to refer to the cloth but the underneath thigh alone. Similar is the position here.

Then the last question as to how both *aanandamaya* and his organ *brahma* be one and the same? Since both are complete in absolute terms, they can be one and the same. Both of them being complete is explained in the subsequent chapters. Hence there is no contradiction in the same person being the whole and its component as well.

Thus, in view of the supporting evidences in considering all the five forms of *annamaya* etc as *Brahma* and with no contradictions, it becomes evident that all the five names refer to the five forms of *Brahma* in the names of *Aniruddha*, *Pradyumna*, *Sankarshana*, *Vasudeva* and *Naarayana* staying in the said shells of *annamaya* etc.

The benefit of this chapter lies in raising an objection that since *Brahma* is only an organ of *Aanandamaya* and that *jijnaasa* (as told in the first *sootra*) of *Brahma* the organ, would not be possible without the *jijnaasa* of the whole *Aanandamaya* and its resolution.

॥ ॐ अन्तस्तद्धर्मोपदेशात् ॐ ॥ ७ ॥

Antas-taddharmo-padeshaat - 7

॥ ॐ भेदव्यपदेशाच्चान्यः ॐ ॥

bheda-vyapadeshaaccha-anyah

अदृश्येऽनात्म्य इति श्रुतस्यानन्दमयधर्मस्यादृश्यत्वस्य अन्तस्थे श्रवणात्तस्य चाविष्णुत्वात्सोऽपि न विष्णुरिति पूर्वक्षेपात्सङ्गतिः । अन्तःप्रविष्टं कर्तारमेतमन्तश्चन्द्रमसि मनसा चरन्तम् । सदैव सन्तं न विजानन्ति देवा इति तैत्तिरीये (तै.आ. ३- ११) अदृश्यत्वादिगुणयुक्तोऽन्तस्थः श्रुतः । देवा अपि न जानन्ति किम्वन्य इति कैमुत्यलब्धत्वाददृश्यत्वस्य । सोऽन्तस्थः किं विष्णुरुत इन्द्रादिरन्य इति सन्देहः । इन्द्रादिरिति पूर्वः पक्षः । इन्द्रो राजा ब्रह्मेन्द्रमग्निमित्यादीन्द्रश्रुतेः । सप्त युञ्जन्ति रथमेकचक्रमिति सूर्यलिङ्गात् अपां नेतारमिति वरुणलिङ्गात्त्वष्टारं रूपाणि विकुर्वन्तमिति त्वष्टृश्रुतेः । अदृश्यत्वादिविष्णुलिङ्गानां निरुढेन्द्रादिश्रुतिलिङ्गेभ्यो दुर्बलत्वात् । विष्णुलिङ्गानां बहुत्वेऽपि श्रुतेः स्वभावप्रयुक्तप्राबल्यस्य बलवत्त्वात् "तयोः स्वभावो बलवान्" इत्युक्तेः निरवकाशत्वेन लिङ्गानामपि बलीयस्त्वे तदुत्तरश्रुतिलिङ्गोभयानुरोधेन इन्द्रादेर्विष्णवैक्यमस्तु । तावतापि विष्णुलिङ्गानामनुपहितरूपाभिप्रायेणोपपत्त्या कल्पितभेद इन्द्रादिरेवान्तस्थ इति ॥

The one who is referred to as “*Aanandamaya*” in the previous chapter has been described in the said *upanishat* as “*adrishye anaatme*”. These qualities of *adrishya* etc are said to belong to someone who dwells inside – *antastha* and not *Vishnu*. Hence even *aanandamaya* is not *Vishnu*. This chapter deals with this objection and hence has the relevance with the previous chapter through an objection – *aakshepaki sangatih*.

taittiriya Aranyaka text of *vedas* describes someone as “*antascharantam ..*”, the one who is within everyone, the doer, the one who is in moon, who moves in the minds and whom the deities do not know even though he is along with them. Thus, the one who is inside everyone is described as *adrishya* – incognizable. When the deities also cannot know him, what to say of others. Whether this *antastha* – inhabitant is *Vishnu* or some one else like the deity *Indra* is the question.

Poorvapaksha – antastha is some one like *Indra*. The vedic text that speaks of *antastha* proceeds to describe him as “*Indro raajaa jagato eeshe*”, indicating that the deity *Indra* is *antastha*, “*brahmendram-agnim jagatah pratishthaam*”, indicating many deities to be *antasthas*, “*sapta yunjanti..* – the one associated with seven and having a chariot of one wheel”, indicating him to be the deity *Sun*, “*apaam netaaram* – the regulating deity of water”, indicating him to be the deity *Varuna* and as “*tvashthaaram roopaani vikurvantam*”, indicating him to be the deity *Tvastra*. In some cases above, there is a specific mention of the names (*shruti*) and in others the deities are described by their unique characteristics (*linga*). Mere *linga* of *Vishnu* being *adrishya* is weaker as compared to both *linga* and *shruti* available in support of *Indra*. Though the *lingas* in favour of *Vishnu* are more in number, *Shruti* stands stronger on account of its inherent nature. So says the script “*tayoh svabhaavo balavaan* – amongst two measures, viz. Being strong on account of multiple instances and being strong on account of a natural factor, the natural factor stands stronger”. Though the unique qualities (*linga*) are stronger on account of being *niravakaasha* - non-accommodative in nature, their conflict can be handled by considering *Indra* etc as one with *Vishnu*, based on the *shruti* and *linga* available for such deities. By considering so, the *lingas* of *Vishnu* remain with him as natural and the artificially different *Indra* etc would be the *antastha*.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ अन्तःसमुद्रे मनसा चरन्तं यस्याण्डकोशं शुष्ममाहुः
 ब्रह्मान्वविन्दद्वशहोतारमर्ण इति श्रुतसमुद्रान्तःस्थत्वं ब्रह्माण्डवीर्यत्वादि-
 ब्रह्मलिङ्गानां भाष्योक्तश्रुत्यादिनाऽनवकाशत्वात् इन्द्रस्यात्मा वायोरात्मानं
 अन्तरादित्य इत्यादिना अस्मिन्नेव प्रकरणे अन्तस्थस्येन्द्रादिभिर्भेद-
 व्यपदेशेनैक्यायोगाच्च इन्द्रादिशब्दानामैश्वर्यादिप्रवृत्तिनिमित्तस्य विष्णावपि
 सत्त्वादन्यगतस्य तदधीनत्वेन तदधीनत्वन्यायाच्च । महायोगेन इन्द्रं मित्रं
 वरुणमग्निमाहुरित्यादिश्रुत्या विद्वद्भूत्या च सप्ताश्वत्वाद्यन्यलिङ्गानां च

शास्त्रदृष्ट्येतिन्यायेन विष्णावपि प्रवृत्तिसम्भवेनान्तस्थो विष्णुरिति । फले तु पूर्वक्षेपसमाधी ॥ ७ ॥

The multiple *lingas* of *Vishnu* as told in vedas like “*antah samudre..*” that speak of him as the one dwelling in the midst of ocean, whose semen being the cause of the universe etc and other evidences as quoted in *Bhaashya* are all *anavakaasha* – rigid and specific to him. He is described in vedas as the one dwelling in *Indra*, *vaayu*, *aaditya* - “*indrasya aatma, vaayor aatmaanam, antaraaditye*” in the same *prakarana* – chapter, where he has been described as *antastha*. This clearly indicates him to be different from *Indra* etc (one can stay in another only when both are different from each other). Hence he cannot be considered as one with *Indra* etc as contended in *poorvapaksha*. As for the names – *shruti*, the qualities etymologically expressed through the names are available with *Vishnu* and hence he is the one who is addressed by such names. Eg., The name *Indra* means the one who regulates wealth. This quality is not just available with *Vishnu* but they are so in their primary sense with *Vishnu* only. If a subordinate holds something, it is as good as his superior holding the same. Even in this sense, *Vishnu* is possessing the referred qualities. All these words *indra* etc speak of *Vishnu* only in their etymologically primary sense, as described in vedic text “*indram mitram varunam agnim aahuh*” and by the usage of the learned people.

As regards the specific *lingas* like “the one having seven horses and a chariot of one wheel”, they need to be understood as explained in the *sootra* “*shastra drishtyaa..*” (Ch. 1.1.12). Thus it is concluded that *Vishnu* is *antastha*.

The benefit of this chapter lies in handling an objection to the conclusion of the previous chapter.

॥ ॐ आकाशस्तलिङ्गात् ॐ ॥ ८ ॥

Aakaashas-tallingaata - 8

अधिकाशङ्कां कृत्वा पूर्वन्यायस्यातिदेशात् आतिदेशिकी वा पूर्ववैषम्येण पूर्वपक्षोत्थानात् प्रत्युदाहरणरूपा वा सङ्गतिः ॥ छान्दोग्ये आद्येऽध्याये आम्लायते (छां. १-९) अस्य लोकस्य का गतिरित्याकाश इति होवाचेत्यादि । तत्र शालावत्यप्रश्नोत्तरत्वेन श्रुतआकाशशब्दः किं भूताकाशवाची उत विष्णुवाचीति सन्देहः । आकाशशब्दस्य आकाशे रुढत्वात् भूताकाशमेवेति प्राप्तम् । न च विष्णुलिङ्गविरोधः । श्रुतितो लिङ्गस्य दुर्बलत्वात् । न च लिङ्गस्य निरवकाशत्वान्निरवकाशलिङ्गेन रुढिबाधः पूर्वत्र सिद्ध इति नास्योत्थितिरिति शङ्क्यम् । इन्द्रादिगतैश्वर्यादेरीशप्रसादलब्धत्वेन तदधीनत्वादितिन्यायेन इन्द्रादिशब्दानामीशवाचित्वेऽपि अचेतने तत्प्रसादाभावेन आकाशपदप्रवृत्ति-हेतोर्विवरत्वस्य तदनधीनत्वादतद्वतत्वाच्चेत्यधिकाशङ्क्योत्थानाद्वा येन लिङ्गेन पूर्वत्र सिद्धान्तः न तेनैवात्र किंत्वन्येन । एवं च प्रागुक्तलिङ्गेन वैष्णवत्वस्य भाष्योक्तश्रुत्यादिना निश्चयेऽप्यत्र तदनिश्चयात् निरुद्धाकाशश्रुत्या भूताकाश एवेति पूर्वः पक्षः ॥ एवमग्रेपि ॥

This chapter deals with additional doubts over the subject of the previous chapter and hence has the sequential relevance with it. This also answers the objections over the previous conclusion.

In its first *adhyaaya*, *Chandogya upanishat* narrates a conversation between a father and son (king *pravaahana* and *shilaka* respectively) as follows - “*asya lokasya kaa gatih* – who supports this world? *Aakaasha* does it”. Whether the said *Aakaasha* is the material (*bhootaakaasha*) space or *Vishnu* is the question. Since the word *aakaasha* is popularly used to refer space, it should be space. This does not conflict *linga* (the quality of being the guardian of the universe), which is specific to *Vishnu*. For, *linga* is weaker in evidence vis-a-vis *shruti* (name). Though *linga* here is *niravakaasha* (specific and rigid) and hence cannot be overridden

by *shruti* as done in the previous chapter, the same cannot be done here. For, in the previous chapter, the names *Indra* etc were considered to belong to *Vishnu* on account of the said qualities of possessing the wealth etc of *Indra* etc were only because of the grace of *Vishnu* and that the said wealth etc were under the control of *Vishnu*. In the present case, it is not so. *Aakaasha*, the space is *jada* - an inert object and there can be no grace of *Vishnu* on an inert object. The word *aakaasha* in its etymological meaning means emptiness. This is neither in the control of *Vishnu* nor is this quality available in *Vishnu*. Had the emptiness been under his control or been his quality, the rule in the previous chapter could have been applied to say that the word *aakaasha* speaks of *Vishnu*. That is not there. Thus, though there could be a conclusion that *antastha* is *Vishnu* based on the availability of quality and control, no such conclusion can be drawn here. Hence going by the usage, the word *aakaasha* speaks of material space only.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ स एष परोवरीयानुद्गीथः स एषोऽनन्त इति परोवरीयस्त्वो-
द्गीथत्वानन्तत्वलिङ्गानां परस्मादुत्तमं प्रोक्तम् (परस्मादुत्तमं प्रोक्तं परो इति ततः
परम् । परोवरं परं तस्मात्प्रोक्तं परोवरीयकम्) इति स्मृत्या परो मात्रयेति श्रुत्या
(ऋ. ७-१९-१) विष्णोर्नुकमिति श्रुत्या (ऋ. १-१५४-१) च
विष्णवेकनिष्ठत्वात्तद्वलेन श्रुतेर्लोकप्रसिद्धित्यागेन विष्णुवाचित्वावश्यंभावादाकाशो
विष्णुरेव । न च निमित्ताभावः । नभो ददाति श्वसतां मार्गं यन्नियमादद इति
स्मृत्या (भाग. ३-३०-४३), चेतनस्येशाधीनत्वे सुतरां जडस्येति
लोकन्यायाच्च तदधीनत्वेन विवरत्वस्य तत्पदनिमित्तस्येशगतत्वाभावेऽपि तत्प्रति
स्वातन्त्र्येण तदधीनत्वादिति वक्ष्यमाणन्यायेन सर्वभूतगुणैर्युक्तमित्यादिस्मृत्या
तद्वत्त्वेन च मुख्यतो विष्णुवाचित्वोपपत्तेरिति ॥ अत्रायमाकाशोऽन्यश्चेद्यदेष
आकाश आनन्दो न स्यादित्युक्तोऽपि विष्णोरन्य इति तदाक्षेपसमाधाने
पूर्वोत्तरपक्षफले ॥ ८ ॥

Veda describes *aakaasha* as *parovareeyaan*, *udgeethah* and *ananta*. These qualities are very specific to *Vishnu*. Let us see how

– *para* means superior. The one who is superior to other deities is *Indra*. *Para*+उ(u) = *paro* is *Rudra* who is superior to *Indra*. One who is *vara*, superior to *paro* is *parovara* – *mukhya praana*. Some one superior to *parovara* is *parovareeyaan*, none other than *Vishnu*. This explanation is had from the script “*parasmaat uttamam..*”. Such supreme individual cannot be space. The word *udgeetha* means the one praised by all – again pointing at *Vishnu* who is at the helm of affairs. The word *ananta* speaks of omnipresence. The material space (environmental space) has an outer boundary (beyond which we can find *avyaakrita aakaasha* – the unbridled space) and hence cannot be counted as *ananta*. *Rig veda* speaks of these qualities as unique to *Vishnu* through the texts “*paro maatrasya tanvaa..*”, “*vishnor nu kam..*”. In view of these evidences, the conflicting usage of the word in material spaces has to be discarded to conclude that the word *aakaasha* speaks of *Vishnu* alone. It is not that the etymological meaning of the word does not fit in *Vishnu*, for *bhaagavata* says “*nabho dadaati svasataam maargam..*” - If space allows a passage to others, it is only because of its controller, God. When even *chetanas* are under the control of *Vishnu*, what to say that the *jada* (which can neither think or act on its own) is under his control as seen in the world.

Though the etymological meaning of *aakaasha* - “being empty” does not fit in *Vishnu*, he gets primarily addressed by that name as would be explained in the *sootra* “*tadadheenatvaat ..*” (Ch.1.4.1) and also because of him staying within *aakaasha* as its regulator as described in the script “*sarvabhootagunair yuktam..*”.

The benefit of this chapter is in resolving the doubt – “if *aakaasha* were not to be *Vishnu* but someone else, based on the vedic text *yadesha aakaash aanando na syaat*, even *aananda* must be some one else”.

॥ ॐ अत एव प्राणः ॐ ॥ ९ ॥

ata eva praanah - 9

अत्राप्यातिदेशिकी वा पूर्ववैषम्येण पूर्वपक्षोत्थानात् प्रत्युदाहरणरूपा वा आकाशाद्वायुरिति श्रौतक्रमेण विचारणाद्वा सङ्गतिः । तद्वै त्वं प्राणो अभव इति तैत्तिरीये (तै. आ. ३-१४) भर्ता सन् भ्रियमाण इत्यनुवाके श्रुतः प्राणः किं मुख्यवायुरुत विष्णुरिति सन्देहः । प्राणशब्दस्य मुख्यवायौ रूढत्वात् प्राणो मुख्यवायुरेवेत्यस्य पूर्वन्यायेन अत्रत्यनिरवकाशलिङ्गेन निरासेऽपि प्राणपदस्य विष्णौ रूढेरभावात्तत्प्रवृत्तिनिमित्तप्राणनाख्यजीवनहेतुत्वस्य "तत्प्राणे प्रपन्न उदतिष्ठत्"(ए. २-१-४) "यत्प्रामिर्यत्परित्याग"(ब्र. सू. भा. २-४-९) इति श्रुतिस्मृतिभिर्वा सुधोक्तदिशा कुलालशरीरस्य घटं प्रतीव मुख्यप्राणशरीर-भूतवायोर्जीवनं प्रत्यन्वयव्यतिरेकदर्शनेन प्रत्यक्षेण चावगतान्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां वा मुख्यवायुगतत्वेन योगस्याप्यभावदिति न प्राणो विष्णुरिति विशेषशङ्क्योत्थानाद्वा पूर्ववन्निरवकाशलिङ्गाभावादिति वा पूर्वः पक्षः ॥

The sequential reference of this chapter with the previous one is on account of the following:

Providing further explanation on the previous conclusion
 Replying to an objection on the previous conclusion
 Going by the sequence as available in the *veda*.

Whether the word "*praana*" as is available in the statement of *Taittireeya aaranyaka* as "*tadvai tvam praanah..*" refers to *mukhya vaayu* or *Vishnu* is the question. Since the usage of the word is in *mukhya vaayu*, it could have been concluded to refer to him. By applying the maxim of the previous chapter and using the specific quality the said conclusion also have been declared invalid. However, such a thing is not possible since the usage of the word "*praana*" is not found in *Vishnu* and the etymological meaning of enabling life is with *mukhya vaayu* as detailed below:

Tat praane prapanna udatishtat – The body got up with the entry of *praana*

Yat praaptir yat parityaagah – Life is when *praana* enters and it is death when he leaves

The way the body of a potter causes the making of a pot, air being the body of *mukhya vaayu* is physically seen to be responsible for life through *anvaya-vyatireka* (existence of life or otherwise being directly related to the movement of air and its absence).

Thus even the etymological meaning does not fit in *Vishnu* and hence it is only *mukhya vaayu* who is addressed by the word “*praana*” and not *Vishnu*.

The *poorvapaksha* is thus through

- raising a doubt as above and
- on account of the absence of any *niravakaasha linga* (specific quality) as was available in the previous chapter, to assign the meaning of the word “*Praana*” to *Vishnu*.

सिद्धान्दस्तु ॥ अद्भ्यः सम्भूत इति पूर्वानुवाके ह्रीश्च ते लक्ष्मीश्च पत्न्याविति श्रुतेन श्रीलक्ष्मीपतित्वरूपनिरवकाशलङ्गेन लोकप्रसिद्धेस्त्याज्यत्वात् । श्रीश्च त इति युष्मच्छब्देनोक्तस्य तद्वैत्वं प्राण इत्यत्रापि युष्मच्छब्देन प्रत्यभिज्ञानेन तयोरनुवाकयोः भिन्नार्थत्वशङ्कानुदयात् भर्ता सन्नित्यनुवाके तमेव मृत्युममृतं तमाहुरित्यादिना अमृतत्वादिलिङ्गश्रवणात् तत्प्राण इति श्रुतेः (ऐ. २-१-४) प्राणस्तथेत्यत्रत्यन्यायेन (ब्र. सू. १-१-२८) वैष्णवत्वात् वायुवृत्तेर्मुख्यप्राण-देहत्वमिव मुख्यप्राणस्यापि विष्णुदेहत्वेनान्वयव्यतिरेकयोरपि तदीयतया तस्यैव जीवनहेतुत्वात् वायुगतस्यापि तदधीनत्वेन तदधीनत्वन्यायात् प्राणस्य प्राण इत्यादौ (तल. १-२) प्रयोगाच्च योगरूढिभ्यां विष्णुरेव प्राणपद वाच्य इति । ह्रीश्च ते लक्ष्मीः पत्न्यौति ह्रीरत्र श्रीरेवेति ध्येयम् ॥ प्रयोजनं तु महान्भोग इति महाभोगशब्दितपूर्णानन्दत्वमुखेनानन्दमयाक्षेपः तत्समाधिश्च ॥ ९ ॥

In the statement preceding the referred vedic statement “*tadvai tvam..*” that begins with “*adbhyah sambhootah*” there is a description that the referred person has two consorts viz. *Hree* and *Lakshmi*. This description is so very specific to *Vishnu* that the usage that is contrary to this has to be discarded. After telling “you have *shree* and *Lakshmi* as wives”, in the subsequent sentence it is said “*tadvai tvam praanah* – the same you is *praanah*”. Hence the statements cannot be considered to refer two different persons. In another statement in the same *mantra* describing him as “*bhartaa san bhriyamaanah*”, it says “*tameva mrityum amritam tam aahuh* – He is the one who causes death while he himself is immortal”. The quality of causing death to all is specific to *Vishnu*. Going by the explanation in the *sootra* “*praanah tathaa anugamaat*” (Ch. 1.1.12), the word *Praana* speaks of *Vishnu* alone. The way physical air is considered as the body of *mukhya praana*, *mukhya praana* himself is the body of *Vishnu*. The relationship between *vaayu* and life – with life existing with the existence of air and not so in its absence will also fit in the case of *Vishnu* since *vaayu* belongs to him and is in his full control. There is also an usage of the word “*praana*” in *Vishnu* as in the case of “*praanasya praanam..* - He is the *praana* of *praana*”. Thus, both on account of the inherent meaning and the usage, the word “*praana*” speaks of *Vishnu* alone.

Based on the vedic text “*hreeshcha te laksmeeshcha*” quoted in *Bhaashya*, it is evident that *hree* is *shree* only.

The benefit of this chapter lies in questioning the conclusion of *aanandamaya* chapter based on the word “*mahaan bhoga*” meaning the one full of pleasure as available in the vedic text “*tad vai tvam praano abhavah mahaanbhogah prajaapateh*” which refers to *praana* and its resolution.

॥ ॐ ज्योतिश्चरणाभिधानात् ॐ ॥ १०॥

Jyotish-charana-abhidhaanaat - 10

पूर्ववेषम्येण पूर्वपक्षोत्थानात्प्रत्युदाहरणरूपा वा श्रौतक्रमाद्वा सङ्गतिः । वि मे कर्णा पतयतो वि चक्षुर्वीदं ज्योतिर्हृदय आहितं यत् । वि मे मनश्चरति दूर आधीः किंस्विद्वक्ष्यामीत्यग्निसूक्ते (ऋ ६-१-६) श्रुतं ज्योतिः किमग्निः उत विष्णुरिति सन्देहः । अग्निरिति पूर्वः पक्षः । ज्योतिःश्रुतेरग्नौ रूढत्वात् तस्य तमोविरोधि-मात्रत्वेऽपि हृदयगुहानिहितत्वलिङ्गेन त्वामग्ने तमसीत्यग्निशब्दसान्निध्याच्च अन्यत्रास्यायोगात् । न च पूर्ववदनवकाशलिङ्गेन श्रुतिबाधात् नास्योत्थितिरिति वाच्यम् । वैषम्यात् । प्राणश्रुतेर्वायुसूक्ताननुग्रहात् अस्यास्तु प्रकरणरूपेणा-ग्निसूक्तेन अनुगृहीतत्वात् । न च श्रुतेर्भूतपरत्वे आकाशनयन्यायेन, देवतापरत्वे च अन्तर्नयन्यायेन विष्णौ सावकाशत्वात्, तस्यास्तथात्वे तद्युक्तसूक्तस्यापि तथात्वात् निरवकाशलिङ्गेन तयोर्बाध इति वाच्यम् । गुहास्थत्वादिलिङ्गस्यापि सावकाशतया ताभ्यां तद्बाधात् । सूक्तस्य वैष्णवत्वे इदमग्निसूक्तं इदं वायुसूक्तमित्यादिव्यवस्थाया “अभिव्यक्तेः”(ब्र. सू. १-२-२९) इत्यादिन्याय-सिद्धत्वेऽपि इदमग्निसूक्तं न विष्णुसूक्तमिति लोकप्रसिद्धयोगेन सूक्तस्य निरवकाशत्वाच्चेति ॥

The sequence of this chapter lies in replying a question on the previous chapter's conclusion and also in the order in which the topics are available in the vedic text (*aatmana aakaashah sambhootah, aakaashaad vaayuh, vaayor agnih..*).

Agni sookta of Rig veda has the following mantra - “vi me karnaa patayatah vi chakshur veedam jyotir hridaya aahitam yat. vi me manah charati doora aadheeh kimsvid vakshyaami ..”. This speaks of some “jyoti” being not reachable by ears, eyes, mind etc and that it is hidden inside the heart. Whether this jyoti is Agni (fire) or Vishnu is the question.

Poorvapaksha – The referred *jyoti* is *Agni*. That is where the usage lies. Though *jyothi* is known only to drive away the darkness, the reference of it being inside the heart (referring to *jaatharaagni*, the heat inside the stomach) and the proximity in usage with the word *Agni* as in “*tvaam agne tamasi..*” makes it not suitable for addressing anything else.

In the previous chapter, *sruti* (name spelt in veda), though strong by its nature has been sidelined while interpreting the word “*praana*” on account of the non-flexible attribute (*niravakaasha linga*) in favour of *Vishnu*, we cannot do a similar thing here to prevent raising the *pooravapaksha* to have *Agni* by the name *Jyothi*. There is a difference. In the case of *praana*, it did not have the support of *vaayusookta* in favour of *praana*. Whereas here, the word *jyothi* is appearing in *agnisookta*, the chapter dealing with *agni* and hence has the support in considering it as referring to *Agni*.

Sruti “*jyothi*” speaks of an inert object and that going by the rule explained in the earlier chapter “*aakashah tallingaat*”, it also speaks of the deity and of *Vishnu* based on the rule in the chapter “*antas taddharmopadeshaat*”. Hence it is *saavakaasha* (flexible). This being so, the *sookta* where it is found also gets considered as *saavakaasha*. Anything that is *saavakaasha* is weak and cannot face an opposition from another, which is *niravakaasha*, non-flexible. Thus, both of them would get barred by a *niravakaasha linga* (attribute) that speaks of *jyothi* as staying inside the heart, the attribute that is specific to *Vishnu*. This is not true. Even this attribute of “staying in cave” can be counted as flexible by considering the word “cave” as referring to the stomach where we find *agni* that is responsible for digestion. With the *linga* being *saavakaasha*, it gets barred by *sruti* that is supported by *prakarana* (*sookta*).

If the referred *sookta* were to be considered as belonging to *Vishnu* on the premise that all *sooktas* speak of him, there would not have been an identification that this is *agni sookta*, this is *vaayu sookta* and so on. Though this aspect is being clarified in the *sootra* “*abhivyakteh..*” (ch. 1.2.7), the usage that this is not *Vishnu sookta* but is *Agni sookta* makes it *niravakaasha* (non-flexible) and hence stands in support of considering the word *jyothi* as speaking of *Agni* and not *Vishnu*.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ वि मे कर्णा पतयत इत्यादिनोक्तापरिच्छिन्नवैभवत्वरूपस्य कर्णादिविदूरत्वलिङ्गस्य परोमात्रयेतिश्रुत्या विष्णवेकनिष्ठत्वेनान्यत्रानव-काशत्वात् प्रकाशत्वरूपज्योतिःपदप्रवृत्तिनिमित्तस्य विष्णौ सत्त्वात् । अन्यगतस्य तदधीनत्वात् तद्वेवा ज्योतिषां ज्योतिः(बृ. ६-४-१६) इत्यादौ प्रयोगाच्च । तस्य च ज्योतिःपदस्य ज्योतिषैकेषामिति(ब्र. सू. १-४-१४) वक्ष्यमाणदिशा वैष्णवत्वात् । विष्णुसूक्तं नेति प्रसिद्धेरज्ञानमूलत्वेन तयोः सावकाशयोः निरवकाशलङ्गेन बाधात् । योगरूढिभ्यां ज्योतिःपदवाच्यो विष्णुरेव सूक्तं च तत्परमिति । फलन्तु हृदय आहितत्वमुखेन यो वेद निहितं गुहायामित्युक्तानन्दमयाक्षेपस्तत्समाधिश्चेति ॥ १० ॥

This *jyothi* has been described as the one whom the ears cannot reach etc (*vi me karnaa patayatah..*). This attribute of being inaccessible to senses and thereby having an unbridled glory is very specific to *Vishnu*. The same is told in Rig Veda as “*paro maatrasyaa tanvaa..*”. The etymological meaning of the word *jyothi*, of being luminous also fits in *Vishnu*. This apart, being the primary regulator, he possesses what is held by others – light in the present case. He is also addressed by the word *jyothi* as in “*taddevaa jyothishaam jyothih*). In the upcoming *sootra* “*jyothishaikeshaam*” in the fourth section of this *adhyaya* how the word *jyothi* speaks of *Vishnu*. The contention that the referred text has appeared in *agni sookta* and not in *Vishnu sookta* and that the usage of the word is not in *Vishnu* is out of ignorance. Both of

these aspects are *saavakaasha* and as such get invalidated by *niravakaasha* (non-flexible) attributes. Hence both by its inherent meaning and by usage, the word *jyothi* refers to *Vishnu* alone. Hence even the *sookta* that speaks of *jyothi* is also of *Vishnu*.

The benefit of this chapter lies in raising an objection to *Vishnu* being *aanandamaya* based on the attribute of being inside the heart as told in “*yo veda nihitam guhaayaam..*” and a confirmation that it is *Vishnu* only.

॥ ॐ छन्दोऽभिधानान्नेति चेन्न तथा चेतोऽर्पणनिगदात्तथा हि दर्शनम् ॐ ॥ ११ ॥

*Chando-abhidhaanaan-neti chenna tathaa cheto-arpana-nigadaat
tathaa hi darshanam – 11*

॥ ॐ भूतादिपादव्यपदेशोपपत्तेश्चैवम् ॐ ॥

॥ ॐ उपदेशभेदान्नेति चेन्न उभयस्मिन्नप्यविरोधात् ॐ ॥

*bhootaadi-paada-vyapadesho-papatte-shchaivam
upadesha-bhedan-neti chenna ubhayasminn-apyavirodhaat*

पूर्वसिद्धान्ताक्षेपेण वा पूर्ववैषम्येण वा पूर्वपक्षप्रवृत्तेः सङ्गतिः । छान्दोग्ये तृतीयेऽध्याये “गायत्री वा इदं सर्वं भूतं यदिदं किञ्च वाग्वै गायत्री” इति श्रुता गायत्री किं वर्णसमावेशरूपच्छन्दः उत विष्णुरिति सन्देहः । छन्दोविशेष इति पूर्वः पक्षः । गायत्रीशब्दस्य तत्र रूढत्वात् । न च विष्णुलिङ्गैः पूर्वत्रेवात्रापि श्रुतिबाधः स्यादिति शङ्क्यम् । विष्णौ प्रसिद्धशब्दव्यागेन अप्रसिद्धगायत्रीपदप्रयोगे प्रयोजनाभावात् । पूर्वत्रैकज्योतिःश्रुतेः लिङ्गेनान्यत्रप्रसिद्धिबाधेऽपि इह “वाग्वै गायत्री” “येयं पृथिवी” इति वाक्-पृथिव्याद्यनेकश्रुतिबाधायोगात् विष्णौ गायत्रीपदस्य रूढेरभावात् योगस्य चामुख्यत्वात् गायत्र्याः वेदविशेषित्वेन नित्यतया ईशाधीनत्वस्यायोगेन, तदधीनत्वस्याप्यनवतारात् । अत एव प्राग्विष्णुवाचितया निर्णीतज्योतिःश्रुतेः अत्रोत्तरवाक्ये “अथ यदतः परो दिवो ज्योतिर्दीप्यत” इति श्रवणात्तद्वलेन प्राक्श्रुता गायत्री विष्णुरिति निरस्तम् । तया बहुश्रुतिबाधायोगात्

"तेजो वै ब्रह्मवर्चसं गायत्री" इति ज्योतिःपर्यायतेजःशब्दस्य गायत्र्यां प्रयोगेण तत्रैव सावकाशत्वाच्च । तद्वलेन पाचीनज्योतिषोऽपि गायत्रीत्वस्यैव न्याय्यत्वात् । यद्वा विष्णुत्वेऽप्यग्रेतनज्योतिषः त्रिपादस्यामृतं दिवीति गायत्र्या द्युस्थत्वोक्त्या दिवःपरत्वेनोक्तज्योतिषो गायत्रीतोऽन्यत्वात् प्राक्तनस्य ज्योतिषः कर्णादिविदूरत्वेन विष्णुत्वेऽपि अत्रत्यस्य तदेतदृष्टं च श्रुतं चेति तद्विरुद्धदृष्टत्वादिश्रवणेनाविष्णुत्वात् न तया ज्योतिःश्रुत्या गायत्री विष्णुरिति ॥

This chapter has a sequential relevance with that of the previous on account of questioning the previous conclusion or on account of raising a different objection on the previous discussion.

In the third *adhyhaaya* of *Chandogya upanishat* we find a statement "*gayatree vaa idam sarvam..*" speaking of *gaayatree* being everything and that it is the speech. Whether this *gayatree* means a *chandas* – the prosody (poetic meter), which is nothing but a formation of letters or *Vishnu* is the question.

Poorvapaksha – *Gaayatree* is a type of *chandas*. That is where the usage of the word lies. The attributes of *Vishnu* found in describing *gaayatree* would not cause any hurdle in accepting this meaning, as was found in the earlier case. Had the intent been to describe *Vishnu*, there was no reason to chose *gaayatree* leaving a good lot of his popular names. In the previous case, one instance of *sruti* in the name of *jyothi* making it popular in *agni* has been countered by the attributes of *Vishnu*. Here, there are many vedic statements like "*vaag vai gaayatree*", "*yeyam prithivee*" that pose an objection for considering *Vishnu*. There is also no usage of the word "*gayatree*" in *Vishnu*. The inherent meaning of the word is secondary vis-a-vis the usage and hence not supportive. Since *gaayatree* is a part of *veda*, it is eternal in existence. Anything that is eternal in existence is not under anyone's control. Hence the word "*gaayatree*" cannot even be considered as speaking of *Vishnu* on account of him being its master by applying the logic of *sootra* "*tadadheenatvaat..*"

(Ch.1.4.1). On account of the aforesaid reasons, even the conclusion of the previous chapter that the word *jyothi* speaks of *Vishnu* is not correct. The *Upanishat* that is speaking of “*gayatree vaa idam sarvam*” in its subsequent sentences says “*atha yad atah paro divo jyotir deepyate*”, describing the positioning of *jyothi* as beyond *gaayatree*, which is in *dyu loka* (heaven). Hence *gaayatree* cannot be *Vishnu*. The word “*jyothi*” that was concluded as *Vishnu* in the previous chapter cannot counter the multiple vedic expressions quoted above. In fact, the said word tends to speak of *gaayatree* as can be seen in “*tejo vai brahmavarchasam gaayatree*” where the word *tejah* that is spoken as *gaayatree* is a synonym of *jyothi*. Basing on this, we can consider that the word “*jyothi*” referenced in the previous chapter also speaks of *gaayatree*.

Another aspect is - even if the earlier *jyothi* is considered as *Vishnu*, it is said to be within *dyu* based on “*tripaadasyaamritam divi* – three parts of it stays in the eternal *dyu*”. This *jyothi* is again considered as *gaayatree*. However, there is another *jyothi* that is different and is staying beyond *dyu*. Though the earlier *jyothi* is considered as *Vishnu* because of his attributes of being beyond the reach of senses, this *jyothi* that is said to be beyond *dyu* cannot be him. This later *jyothi* is described as seen, heard etc and hence cannot be *Vishnu*. Hence the word “*jyothi*” does not address *Vishnu*.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ “ततो ज्यायांश्च पुरुषः” “यद्वैतद्ब्रह्म” “एतामेवं ब्रह्मोपनिषदं वेद” इति पुरुषब्रह्मादिश्रुतीनां गायति च त्रायति चेत्युक्ताशेषवेदोच्चारणाख्यगानत्राण-कर्तृत्वस्य पादोऽस्य विश्वा भूतानीत्यादिनोक्तभूतादिपादत्वस्य एतामेव नातिशीयन्त इत्युक्तसर्वोत्तमत्वादेर्लिङ्गस्य च बाहुल्यात्, तत्पदप्रवृत्तिनिमित्त-गुणवत्तयोपासनार्थमप्रसिद्धपदप्रयोगोपपत्तेः । बहुभिः श्रुतिलिङ्गैर्बहूनां शब्दानां प्रसिद्धार्थत्यागसम्भवात् । गायति च त्रायतिचेत्युक्त्याऽज्ञरुद्धितो बलवता श्रौतयोगेन अनादिगुणादीनां स्वभावजीवकर्माणीत्यादिश्रुत्यपेक्षयाऽनादि-

नित्यस्यापि ईशाधीनत्वसम्भवेन तदधीनत्वन्यायाच्च । महायोगेन सर्वच्छन्दोभिधो ह्येष इति पौराणिकरूढ्या च गायत्री विष्णुरित्यग्रेतनं प्राक्तनं च ज्योतिः स एव । द्युस्थत्वदिवःपरत्वादृश्यत्वदृष्टत्वाद्युपदेशभेदस्य त्रिसप्तलोकविवक्षया आकारभेदेन चोपपत्तिरिति ॥ फले तु प्राचीनज्योतिषो विष्णुत्वाक्षेपतत्समाधी वा, अस्यां हीदं सर्वं प्रतिष्ठितमित्युक्तस्थितिहेतुमुखेन जन्मादिसूत्राक्षेपतत्समाधी वेति ॥ ११ ॥

The same *chandogya upanishat* that said “*gaayatree vaa idam sarvam..*” (3.12.1) describes this *gayatree* as *purusha* as in “*tato jyaanscha purushah..*” (3.12.6), as *brahma* as in “*yadvai tad brahma*” (3.12.7) and “*etamevam brahma upanishadam veda*” (3.11.3). Both these names refer to *Vishnu*. The etymological meaning of *gaayati traayati* – one who sings the entire of vedas and protects them speaks of the unique character of *Vishnu*. The said *upanishat* describes the entire of universe as a quarter of *gaayatri* (3.12.6), which again is the attribute of *Vishnu*. It also says “*etameva naatisheeyante*” (3.12.2-3) indicating it to be the supreme – a quality that is unique to *Vishnu*. The contention that there is no purpose in picking up some name that is not in use for *Vishnu* while scores of specific names exists has no purpose is ill founded. For, the name *Gaayatree* is picked up to describe his qualities through its etymological meaning to support *upaasana* (meditation). The popular meaning of the word “*gayatree*” need to be discarded in view of several vedic texts and attributes going against it.

By describing him as *gaayati* and *trayati* through the etymological meaning of the word, superiority of vedic meaning over *ajna roodhi* (common man’s usage) is counted in support of the word for *Vishnu*. The way the inherent qualities of an individual are under his control in spite of them being *anaadi* - eternally existent, even considering the word to speak of a prosody that is eternal, it speaks of its controller, *Vishnu* as per the rule in *sootra*

“*tadaadheena..*”. The fact that even eternally existent things are also under the control of *Vishnu* is clearly described in the script “*svabhaava-jeeva-karmaani..*”. Going by the *mahaayoga* – the primary individual having the etymological meaning of the word and by the usage in *puraanas*, the word *gaayatree* speaks of *Vishnu* only. So is the case with the earlier *jyothi*.

The contradiction that *Vishnu* is staying inside *dyu* and that *jyothi* is staying beyond *dyu* does not exist. For, he is said to stay beyond *dyu* when the worlds are classified in to seven and he is inside *dyu* when the worlds are classified as three. Similarly, being visible and not visible also suit him with reference to his forms.

The benefit of this chapter lies in raising an objection on *jyothi* being considered as speaking of *Vishnu* and its resolution. Another benefit is questioning the attribute of *Vishnu* being the mentor of everything as indicated in the *sootra* “*janmaadyasya yatah*” based on the statement “*asyaam hi idam sarvam pratishtitam*” referring to *gaayatri* and its resolution through a confirmation that *gaayatri* is nothing but *Vishnu*.

॥ ॐ प्राणस्तथानुगमात् ॐ ॥ १२ ॥

Praanas-tatha-anugamaat -12

॥ ॐ न वक्तुरात्मोपदेशादिति चेदध्यात्मसम्बन्धभूमा ह्यस्मिन् ॐ ॥

॥ ॐ शास्त्रदृष्ट्या तूपदेशो वामदेववत् ॐ ॥

॥ ॐ जीवमुख्यप्राणलिङ्गान्नेतिचेन्नोपासान्नैविध्यादाश्रितत्वादिह तद्योगात् ॐ ॥

na vaktu-raatmo-padeshaaditi ched-adhyaatma-sambandha-bhooma-hyasmin; shaastra-drishtyaa toopadesho vama devavat;
jeeva-mukhya-praana-lingaanneti chenna upaasaa-traividhyaad
aashritatvaad iha tadyogaat;

अत्र श्रुतिलिङ्गबाहुल्येन पूर्वसिद्धान्तन्यायेन पूर्वपक्षप्रवृत्तेरापवादिकी सङ्गतिः । ऐतरेये “ता वा एताः शीर्षञ्छ्रियः श्रिताश्चक्षुः श्रोत्रं मनो वाक् प्राणः” (ऐ. २-१-४) इत्यादिना बहुस्थलेषु श्रुतः प्राणः किं मुख्यवाय्वादिरुत विष्णुरिति सन्देहः । वाय्विन्द्रजीवा इति पूर्वः पक्षः ॥ तच्छ्रुतिलिङ्गानां बाहुल्यात् । तथाहि । चक्षुश्रोत्रादिभिः सह पाठः, ता अहिसंतेत्यादिनोक्तानि “प्राणविवादो देहादुत्क्रमणप्रवेशौ ततो देहपातोत्थाने प्राणसंवादश्च” इत्यादीनि मुख्यप्राणलिङ्गानि तत्सहचरितप्राणश्रुतिश्च । तथा “तं यच्छतं वर्षाण्यभ्यार्चत्” इति (ऐ. २-२-१) श्रुतशतायुष्ट्वं तत्सहपठितपुरुषश्रुतिः “प्राणो वंश” (ऐ. ३-२-१) इति चक्षुरादीन् प्रति वंशत्वमित्यादिजीवलिङ्गानि इन्द्रो वै वृत्रं हत्वेत्याद्युक्तवृत्रहननमहाव्रतयाजित्वादिलिङ्गानि “तमिन्द्र उवाच प्राणो वाहमस्म्यृष” (ऐ. २-२-३) इति इन्द्रप्रयुक्ताहंश्रुतिश्चेति श्रुतिलिङ्गबाहुल्यं श्रूयते । नचैतानि विष्णौ सम्भवन्तीति ॥

The *poorvapaksha* of this chapter is formed based on the available multiple *srutis* (vedic expression) and *linga* (attributes) and on the rule established in the previous *sootra*. Hence this has a sequence of exception with the previous chapter.

Whether “*Praana*” as found in many places in *Aithareya upanishat*, like “*taa vaa etaah ...chakshuh srotram mano vaak praanah*”, refers to *Mukhyavaayu* (the deity responsible for life and activities) or *Vishnu* is the question.

Poorvapaksha – The word “*Praana*” refers to *Vaayu*, *Indra* and *Jeeva*. There are many vedic expressions and attributes described for *Praana* that fit into these persons. Let us have a look at them -

- *Praana* is counted along with *chakshuh* etc – eyes, ears, mind and speech. The said *upanishat* narrates an event where these deities (in charge of the functionalities of eyes, ears etc) had an argument wherein each one said he is superior to others. Then an experiment was done to test

their superiority. In that, each one of them left the body one after another. The body became blind, deaf etc but did not fall. When *Praana* left the body, it fell. Similarly, when each one of them entered the body, the body did not get up but did so when *Praana* entered the same. The above narration makes it clear that *Praana* is *Mukhyavaayu*. The associated vedic expressions also stand in support of this.

The same *upanishat* describes *Praana* as “*tam yat shatam varshaani abhyaarchat*” indicating a hundred years of life. It also says “*praano vamshe iti sthavirah..*” wherein it narrates the senses like eyes, ears, mind, speech are staying in *praana*. These descriptions indicate that *praana* is *jeeva*. This *upanishat* also narrates a conversation where *Indra* says “*praano vaa ahamasmi rishe – O sage! I am praana*”. Prior to this, it explains how *Indra* became great by killing the demon *Vritra* and after performing the *yajna* called *mahaavrata*. Thus the reference to name “*Indra*” is specific and he himself says that he is *Praana*. The specific attributes of *Indra* and the expression “I am” make it clear that *Praana* is *Indra*.

The above descriptions cannot be attributed to *Vishnu*.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ एतद्ब्रह्मैतत्सत्यं (ऐ. २-१-१), तं प्रपदाभ्यां प्रापद्यत ब्रह्मेणं पुरुषं (ऐ. २-१-४), अ इति ब्रह्म (ऐ. २-३-८) इत्यादिश्रुतीनां तं देवाः प्राणयन्त (ऐ. २-१-५), तं भूतिरिति देवा उपासाञ्चक्रिरे (ऐ. २-१-८), सर्वे वेदा (ऐ. २-२-२) इति, प्राणो ह्येष य एष तपति (ऐ. २-२-१), प्राणस्त्वं प्राणः सर्वाणि भूतानि (ऐ. २-२-३) आपिपीलिकाभ्यः प्राणेन बृहत्याविष्टब्धानि इत्यादिना (ऐ. २-१-६) श्रुतानां देवोपदेश्यत्व, भूतित्वप्रकारकदेवोपास्यत्व, सर्ववेदप्रतिपाद्यत्व सूर्यमण्डलस्थत्व, सर्वान्तर्यामित्व, सर्वव्यापित्वलिङ्गानां च भाष्याद्युक्तवचनान्तरबलेन विष्णवेकनिष्ठत्वात् प्रागुक्तश्रुत्यादितोऽपि बाहुल्याच्च । प्रागुक्तश्रुतिलिङ्गानां तत्तदन्तर्यामिस्थतया सावकाशत्वात् । उदासीनवदा-

स्तामित्यस्य (बृ. भा. २-१-४) बाह्यरूपविषयत्वेनाविरोधात् । इन्द्रप्रयुक्ताहंशब्दस्यापि अहं मनुर्भवम् इत्यादौ वामदेवप्रयुक्ताहंशब्दवत्त्वक्षण्या वा, “सर्वान्तर्यामिको विष्णुः सर्वनाम्नाभिधीयते । एषोऽहं त्वमसौ च” इत्यादि-स्मृत्या (ब्र.सू. भा. १-१-१७) मुख्यवृत्त्या वा अन्तर्यामिपरत्वात् प्राणो विष्णुरेवेति । फले तु अत एव प्राण इत्युक्तप्राणस्य विष्णुत्वाक्षेपसमाधी ॥१२॥

Let us have a look at how *praana* has been described in the said *upanishat* -

- He is *Brahma* and *Satya* - “*etat brahma etat satyam*”, “*tam prapadaabhyaam praapadyat*”, “*brahmemam purusham*”
Devopadeshyatva – Subject of the discourses of deities - “*tam devaah praanayante* – the deities teach his glory to others”
Bhootiriti devopaasyatva – Deities doing his *upaasana* considering him as prosperous - “*tam bhootiriti devaa upaasaam chakrire*”.
Subject matter of all *vedas* - “*sarve veda yatpadam aamananti*”
Dwelling in Sun - “*praano hyesha tapati*”
Sarvaantaryaami – dwelling in everyone - “*praanastvam praanah sarvaani bhootaani*”
Sarva vyaapitva – spread everywhere - “*sarvaani bhootaani aapipeelikaabhyah praanena brihatyaa vishthabhdhaani*”

All these descriptions and the descriptions in the quotes provided in *Bhaashya* are specific to *Vishnu* and are in larger number vis-a-vis the *srutis* quoted in *poorvapaksha*. This apart, those *srutis* are accommodative to allow reference to the one who is dwelling inside the individuals to whom they are apparently pointing at.

In the anecdote referred in *poorvapaksha*, it is said that the experiment was done in the body of *chaturmukha*. The question now is whether *Chaturmukha* and *Vishnu* stayed there in that body or not. If they were staying and the body fell with the exit of *vaayu*, it would mean *vaayu* as superior to them both. If they did not stay there, it would not be considered as *chaturmukha*'s body and in the absence of *Vishnu*, it would not have got up even after the entry of *Vaayu*. This question is answered by the quotation provided by Acharya in his commentary on *Brihadaraanyaka upanishat*, where a similar narration exists. Both of them were present but they stayed neutral without influencing the effect of exit and entry of deities.

As regards the statement of *Indra* "I am *praana*", the expression "I am" refers to the one dwelling in him as could be seen in a similar expression "*aham manurabhavam sooryascha*" spoken by *Vaamadeva* and also as evidenced in script "*sarvaantaryaamiko vishnuh sarvanaamna-abhidheeyate, eshoham tvamasou cha* – *Vishnu* stays inside everyone and is addressed by all names including those like *eshah* – this one, *aham* - me, *tvam* - you, *asou* – he".

The benefit of this chapter lies in raising an objection on the conclusion of the chapter "*ata eva praanah*" and its resolution.

॥ इति श्रीराधवेन्द्रयतिकृतायां न्यायमुक्तावल्यां आद्येऽध्याये प्रथमः पादः ॥

प्रथमाध्याये द्वितीयः पादः

श्रीगुरुभ्यो नमः ॥ एवमनन्तवेदगताशोषनाम्नां तत्तद्वाक्यगताशेषलिङ्गैः वैष्णवत्वे अभिहिते तत्र विप्रतिपन्नलिङ्गानां समन्वयोऽत्र पादे निरूप्यते ॥

After thus showing that the infinite names appearing in *vedas* speak of *Vishnu* on the basis of the descriptions available in the respective expressions, this section now deals with disputes in synchronizing the *linga*, attributes in favour of *Vishnu*.

॥ ॐ सर्वत्र प्रसिद्धोपदेशात् ॐ ॥ १ ॥

sarvatra prasiddho-padeshaat - 1

॥ ॐ विवक्षितगुणोपपत्तेश्च ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ अनुपपत्तेस्तु न शरीरः ॐ ॥

॥ ॐ कर्मकर्तृव्यपदेशाच्च ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ शब्दविशेषात् ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ स्मृतेश्च ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ

अर्भकौकस्त्वात्तद्व्यपदेशाच्च नेति चेन्न निचाय्यत्वादेवं व्योमवच्च ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ

सम्भोगप्राप्तिरिति चेन्न वैशेष्यात् ॐ ॥

vivakshita-guno-papatteshcha; anupapattestu na shaareerah;

karma-kartr-vyapadeshaa-ccha; shabdavisheshaat; smriteshca;

*arbhakau-kastvaat-tadvyapadeshaa-ccha neti chenna nichaayyatvaad-evam
vyomavaccha;*

sambhogapraaptirिति chenna vaisheshyaat;

पूर्वोत्तरपादान्त्याद्यनययोर्नाविशयं सङ्गत्यपेक्षा । अपेक्षायां तु पूर्वाक्षेपादाक्षेपिकी । ऐतरेये "चत्वारः पुरुषा इति बाध्व" इति खण्डे (ऐ. ३-२-३) तस्यैतस्यासावादित्यो रस इत्युपक्रम्य एतं ह्येव बह्वृचा महत्युक्थे मीमांसंत इत्यादिना उक्थाग्निहाव्रतपृथिवीद्यु-वाय्वाकाशौषधिवनस्पतिचन्द्रनक्षत्रेषूक्त्वा सर्वेषु भूतेष्येतमेव ब्रह्मेत्याचक्षत इत्यादिना सर्वभूतगतः कश्चिदाम्नायते । स सर्वत्र श्रुतः किमादित्यजीवौ विष्णुर्वेति सन्देहः ॥ तत्र पूर्वः पक्षः ॥ प्रागसकृच्छ्रुतादित्यपदोक्तस्यैव एतमिति परामर्शात् तस्य च तस्यैतस्येति पदेन

प्रस्तुतसंवत्सरं परामृश्य रस इति तत्सारत्वाख्यलिङ्गोक्त्या आदित्यपरत्वात्, चित्रं देवानामिति सौरमन्त्रोदाहरणात्, आदित्ये एतमिति विशिष्यादित्येऽनुक्तत्व-
लिङ्गाच्च आदित्य एव सर्वगत इति वा, चक्षुर्मयः श्रोत्रमय इत्यादिना तेष्वेतमिति
भूतपदोपादानबलाद्भूतादन्यत्राभावप्रतीत्या प्राप्ताल्पौकस्त्वलिङ्गाच्च, वक्ष्यमाण-
परामर्शित्वस्याप्येतच्छब्दे तत्र तत्र दर्शनात्, सर्वे जीवा वा, न तु विष्णुः, उक्त-
श्रुतिलिङ्गानामयोगात् । सर्वभूतगतत्वे तद्वत्सुखदुःखादिभोगप्राप्तेश्चेति प्राप्तम् ॥

There is no need to verify the sequential reference between the last chapter of the previous section and the first chapter of the next section. If sought to know, it is available here in the form of an objection to the previous conclusion.

Aithareya aaranyaka starts its 3rd chapter (of its 2nd *adhyaya* of 3rd *Ghatta*) with the statement “*chatvaarah purushaa iti baadhva – vaayu* says there are four *purushas – shareera, chanda, veda and mahaa*”. In the said chapter, it starts a discussion with “*tasya etasya asou aadityo rasah*”. It then says this person is discussed at length. He is considered as present in *uktha*, in *agni*, in *mahaavrata*, in *prithivi*, in *dya*, in *vaayu*, in *aakaasha*, in *oshadhi* (trees), in *vanaspathi* (herbs), in moon, in stars and in all living beings. He is then named as *Brahama*. Whether the aforesaid person who is dwelling in everything is *aaditya* and *jeeva* or *Vishnu* is the question.

Poorvapaksha – The person referred to as dwelling in everything is *aaditya*, for

The one who is addressed as “*aaditya*” multiple times, is the one who is referenced with the word “*etam - him*” in “*etam chandramasi, etam agnou* etc – him in moon, him in fire etc”

He has been referred to as the essence of “year” through the words “*asou aadityo rasah*”, after speaking about the year. *Soorya sookta* beginning with “*chitram devaanaam*” says “*soorya aatmaa jagatah* – *soorya* dwells in everything of the world”.

While the quoted vedic text says him to be dwelling in *agni*, *vaayu*, *chandra* etc, it does not say him to be in *aaditya*.

The one dwelling in everything could be *jeeva*. For

- He is being described as *chakshurmaya*, *shrotramaya* etc indicating the existence of a relationship with the sense organs of eyes, ears etc. These are characteristics of *jeeva*. He is described as staying inside *bhootas*. This implies that he is not outside of them. This quality of staying in small places is specific to *jeeva*. In the subsequent sentences, he is referred to as “*etat* – this”. Such an expression is possible only for those who are in the physical proximity. It can only be *jeeva*.

Hence the person referred to as dwelling within everything is *jeeva* and not *Vishnu*, for the *sruti* and *linga* presented above do not fit in for him. If he were to be in everyone, he would be experiencing the pains and pleasures of all of them.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ एतमेव ब्रह्मेत्याचक्षत इति ब्रह्मशब्दस्य “तदेव ब्रह्म परमं कवीनाम्” (महाना. उ.) इत्यादौ विष्णौ प्रसिद्धत्वात् । जात्यादेर्ब्रह्मपदा-मुख्यार्थस्य विष्णोर्ब्रह्मपदमुख्यार्थस्य सत्त्वेन एतमेवेत्यवधारणायोगात्, तद्वलेन ब्रह्मपदेनात्र मुख्यार्थस्यैव ग्राह्यत्वात् । स योऽतोऽश्रुतोऽगतोऽमत इत्यादिनोत्तरवाक्येनोक्तानां कात्स्न्येनाश्रुतत्वादिलिङ्गानां च सत्त्वात् । “अहमात्मा गुडाकेशा सर्वभूताशायस्थित” (भ. गी. १०-२०) इति स्मृतिसमाख्यानाच्च साधकसत्त्वात् । संवत्सरो वै प्रजापतिरित्यादेः

संवत्सरपदस्य विरिञ्चपरतया तत्सारत्वस्य अन्तन यन्यायेनादित्यश्रुतेः सर्वगतत्वादेव अल्पस्थानेऽपि स्थितेः विष्णावलपस्थानत्वरूपाल्पौकस्त्वस्य व्योमवदुपपत्तेः । भूतपदस्य तथोपासनार्थत्वात् । संभोगप्राप्तेश्च सामर्थ्यवैशेष्येण सुपरिहरत्वेन “भूतेषु” इत्यनेन चादित्यस्थत्वस्याप्युपपत्तेः । चक्षुरादिस्वामित्वादिरूपचक्षुर्यत्वादेरपि संभवेन बाधकानां अभावात् । अणोर्जीवस्यादित्यस्य वा सर्वगतत्वाद्ययोगेन परपक्षे बाधकभावाच्च पृथिव्यादौ सर्वत्रोच्यमानो विष्णुरेवेति ॥

फलं तु भूतेष्वेतमेव आदित्यादिकमेव नान्यदित्येवकारेण विष्णोर्भूतादन्यत्रैव सत्त्वप्रतीत्या ब्रह्म ततममपश्यत् (ऐ. २-४-३) इति पूर्वनयनिर्णयश्रुत्युक्त-
व्याप्तत्वाख्यसर्वगतत्वमयुक्तमिति पूर्वाक्षेपस्तत्समाधिश्चेति ॥ १ ॥

The word *Brahma* as found in “*etameva brahmetyaachakshate*” is well known to point at *Vishnu* as can be seen in “*tadeva brahma paramam kaveenaam*” etc. Out of the several meanings for the word “*Brahma*”, those like “*jaati*” are secondary and only *Vishnu* is the primary meaning. We need to take the primary meaning only here in the statement “*etameva brahmetyaachakshate*” in view of the word “*eva*” that eliminates others. This apart, in the following sentence, this *brahma* is described as “*yo ato ashrito*” etc, the one who is spread everywhere and cannot be understood through listening etc. These qualities are specific to *Vishnu*. Bhagavad Geeta also says similarly - “*aham aatmaa gudaakesha sarvabhootashaya-sthitah*” where Krishna says that he stays in everyone controlling them. The vedic expression “*samvatsaro vai prajaapatih*” states that *Chaturmukha* is *samvatsara* – year. *Vishnu* is his essence. On account of being the regulator and staying within *aaditya*, he is *aaditya* as per the rule in *sootra* “*antastad-dharmopadeshaat*”. Since he is omnipresent, though he is present everywhere, he is also present in small areas, the way it is true for space. The expression “*sarveshu bhooteshu*” is meant for doing *upaasana* of that quality of *Vishnu*. The objection that if he were to

stay in all *jeevas*, he would have to experience their pleasures and pains is unfounded. For, he avoids it on account of his extraordinary capabilities. The expression “*sarveshu bhooteshu*” also means that he stays in *aaditya* as well. As for the expressions like “*chakshurmaya*” etc, they fit in him on account of him being their master. The atomic sized *jeeva* or *aaditya* cannot be omnipresent and hence the contention of them being referred to by the word “*aaditya*” is invalid.

Hence the one who is stated to be within everything like *prithivi* is *Vishnu* only.

The benefit of this chapter lies in resolving the contention that “*bhooteshu etameva*” refers to *aaditya* being in everyone, making it appear like *Vishnu* stays elsewhere than in *jeevas* and that the conclusion in the previous chapter that *Vishnu* is omnipresent based on the vedic script “*brahma tatamam apashyat*”.

॥ ॐ अन्ता चराचरग्रहणात् ॐ ॥ २ ॥

attaa charaachara-grahanaat - 2

॥ ॐ प्रकरणाच्च ॐ ॥

prakaranaaccha

अत्र पूर्ववैषम्येण पूर्वपक्षोत्थानात् प्रत्युदाहरणरूपा संगतिः । वाजसनेये तृतीयेऽध्याये “स यद्यदेवासृजत तत्तदत्तुमधियत सर्वं वा अत्तीति तददितेरदितित्वम्” इति (बृ.३-२-५) श्रुतम् । तत्र सर्वं वा अत्तीत्यनेन लब्धोऽन्ता किमदितिर्देवमाता अथ विष्णुरिति संदेहः । (पूर्वपक्षस्तु) अदितिरेवेति प्राप्तं तददितेरित्यादिश्रुतेः अदितित्वलिङ्गाच्च । आदित्यशब्द-पर्यायसवितृश्रुतेरन्तर्नयविषयवाक्ये श्रुतायाः वैष्णवत्वसिद्ध्या आदित्यश्रुतेः पूर्वत्र विष्णुपरत्वेऽप्यत्र तदसिद्ध्या श्रुतेर्निरवकाशत्वात् । लिङ्गस्याप्यतृत्व-

रूपतयाऽनश्रुतिश्रुत्या अनन्तुर्विष्णोरयोगादिति द्वयोर्निखकाशत्वाद्वा
श्रुतेरन्तर्नयन्यायेन सावकाशत्वेऽपि निखकाशल्लिङ्गानुगृहीतत्वाद्देति ॥

Since this chapter raises a different query on the conclusion of the previous chapter, it has the sequential reference with it in the form of a reply.

Brihadaaranyaka upanishat has a narration “*sa yadyadeva asrijat, tat tat attum adhriyata, sarvam vaa atti iti tad aditer adititvam* – Whatever did it create, it decided to eat it all. Since it eats everything, it is called *aditi*”. Whether this *Aditi*, described as all-eater, is the mother of deities or *Vishnu* is the question.

Poorvapaksha – *Aditi* refers to the mother of deities. For, the vedic text names her and describes her as the one who eats everything. Earlier, while discussing the *sootra* “*antastad-dharmopadeshaat*” the subject of reference was picked up from *taittireeya aaranyaka*. The word *savitṛ*, which is a synonym of *aaditya*, appearing there was shown to address *Vishnu* on the basis of him being the one dwelling in everyone and being the controller of the thing where he stays. Such a thing is not possible here in view of *sruti* (“*aditi*”) being non-accommodative. Even the all-eater *linga* does not fit it *Vishnu* on account of him being described as the one who does not eat anything in the vedic text “*anasnan anyat abhichaakasheeti*”. Thus there are two non-accommodative indicators of *sruti* and *linga*. Even if *sruti* is considered as accommodative based on the rule in *sootra* “*antastad-dharmopadeshaat*” it stands here as non-accommodative on account of the support from a non-accommodative *linga*.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ सर्वं वा अत्तीत्युक्तसर्वातृत्वरूपसंहर्तृत्वस्य “यमप्येति भुवनं
सांपराये” (घृत. सू.), “स्रष्टा पाता तथैवात्ता” इत्यादि (स्कान्द पु.)

श्रुतिस्मृतिभिः विष्णवेकनिषठत्वात् तस्यैवादितिपदप्रवृत्तिनिमित्ततयाऽदितित्व-
लिङ्गस्य अदितिश्रुतेश्च विष्णौ सावकाशत्वात् नैवेह किंचनाग्र
आसीन्मृत्युनैवेदमावृतमासीदित्यनवकाशब्रह्मप्रकरणाच्च विष्णुरेवात्तेति ।
अनश्नश्रुतिगतिस्तु वक्ष्यते ॥ फलं तु श्रुतिलिङ्गबलाददितेः संकुचितसर्वार्त्तत्वे
विष्णोस्तदन्यकतिपयात्तृत्वस्यैव सिद्धांतिना लक्षणत्वेन वाच्यत्वादितिव्याप्तिरिति
वा अदितेरेवासंकुचितसर्वार्त्तत्वमिति वा जन्मादिसूत्राक्षेपस्तत्समाधिश्वेति ॥ २ ॥

The description “*sarvam vaa atti* – eats everything” typically fits only in *Vishnu* on account of various *sruti* and *smriti* like “*yamapyeti bhuvanam saamparaaye* – in whom the entire of *bhuvana*, the universe enters at the time of *pralaya* – a total holocaust”, “*srashtaa paataa thathaiva attaa* – he is the creator, protector and destroyer”. Hence it is him where the true etymological description of the word *aditi* fits in. Hence both *sruti* and *linga* of the word “*aditi*” are accommodative of *Vishnu*. The referred expression describing *aditi* falls under *brahma prakarana* which goes as “*naiveha kinchana..*” describing *brahma*. Hence the one referred to by the word *aditi* is *Vishnu* alone. As regards the objection that *Vishnu* is described as the one who does not eat anything, it will be resolved (in the chapter *dyu-bhvaadyaayanam..*).

When the word *aditi* is considered as speaking of the mother of deities on the basis of *sruti* and *linga*, its meaning of all-eater also gets restricted only to that, which she can eat. With this, those things that *aditi* could not eat only would fall into the ambit of *Vishnu* for destruction. Thus the quality of all-destroyer stated as unique to *Vishnu* finds a limitation and with that limitation, it also gets fit in *aditi* – hence *ativyaapti* (the uniqueness getting diluted with some one else also qualifying for the attribute) or going by the vedic expression, it could mean *aditi* only as the ultimate destroyer of everything. The benefit of this chapter lies in resolving the above conflict.

॥ ॐ गुहां प्रविष्टावात्मानौ हि तद्वर्शनात् ॐ ॥ ३ ॥

guhaam pravishtaa-vaatmaanou hi taddarshanaat - 3

॥ ॐ विशेषणाच्च ॐ ॥

visheshanaaccha;

अत्र प्रागुक्तातृत्वविशेषस्य कर्मफलभोक्तृत्वस्य चिंतनाद्वा पूर्वाक्षेपेण पूर्वपक्षोत्थानाद्वा संगतिः । काठके तृतीयवल्लीयां "ऋतं पिबंतौ सुकृतस्य लोके गुहां प्रविष्टौ" इति श्रुतवाक्ये ऋतं पिबन्तावित्युक्तौ कर्मफलभोक्तारौ किं जीवेश्वरौ किं वा ईश्वररूपविशेषौ इति संदेहः । पिबन्ताविति द्विवचनश्रुतेर्द्वित्ववाचित्वात् तस्य चाभेदेऽयोगात् कर्मबन्धविधुरे कर्मफलभोक्तृत्वस्याप्ययोगात् । छत्रिन्यायेन सजातीयौ भोक्तृजीवेश्वरावेवेति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः । गुहां प्रविष्टावित्युक्तगुहानिविष्टत्व-लिङ्गस्य "यो वेद निहितं गुहायां" (तै. उ. २-१), "गुहाहितं गह्वरेष्ठं पुराणम्" इत्यादिना विष्णोरेव प्रसिद्धत्वात् । यः सेतुरीजानानामक्षरं ब्रह्म तत्परम् । अभयं तितीर्षतां पारमित्युत्तरवाक्ये श्रुतात्परत्वविशेषणयुक्तब्रह्मशब्दात् "एषसेतुर्विधृतिः" (छा. ८-४-१) इत्यादिश्रुत्यन्तरसिद्धसेतुत्वाभयत्वा-दिलिङ्गाच्च, "आत्मान्तरात्मेति हरिरेक एव द्विधास्थितः" (बृ. संहिता) इत्यादिस्मृतेरेकस्यापि रूपविशेषेण द्वित्वोपपत्तेः । "शुभं पिबत्यसौ नित्यं नाशुभं स हरिः पिबेत्" (पाद्म. पु.) इत्यादेः कर्मफलभोक्तृत्वस्य संभवादनश्च श्रुतेर-शुभभोक्तृत्वाभावपरतयोपपत्तेः ऋतंपिबन्तावीश्वररूपविषावेवेति ॥ फले तु पूर्वोक्तसर्वार्त्तत्वाक्षेपसमाधी । तत्प्रकारश्च चन्द्रिकोक्तः ॥ ३ ॥

While the previous chapter dealt with eating of everything, this chapter deals with eating the results of *karma*. Hence has the sequential reference with the previous chapter. "Eating", "drinking" etc here means enjoying / suffering the pleasures and pains. This "eating" etc is referred to as *bhoga* (consumption) hereunder.

In the third *valli* (division) of *kaathaka upanishat*, we find a statement "*ritam pibantou sukritasya loke guhaam pravishtou -*

There are two individuals in the cave, both of whom are drinking the good". Whether these two who are described as consuming the results of *karma* are *jeeva* and *eeshwara* or just two forms of *eeshwara* only is the question.

The expression "*pibantou*" speaks of two persons. Since *Vishnu* is a single person in whom multiplicity has no room, he cannot be considered as the subject of the referred vedic expression. This apart, *Vishnu* has no binding of *karma* and hence cannot be considered as someone consuming the results of *karma*. Hence the two individuals should be considered as *Jeeva* and *Vishnu*. Though *Vishnu* does not consume the results of *karma*, he is counted along with *Jeeva* (who consumes the same). This is similar to calling two persons under an umbrella as *chatri* (holding umbrella) while only one of them is holding it.

In the referred statement, the two are said be residing in the cave of heart. This attribute is known only for *Vishnu* as can be seen through the texts "*yo veda nihitam guhaayaam..*" and "*guhaahitam gahvareshtam puraanam*" etc. In the succeeding sentence *kaathaka upanishat* says "*yah setur eejaanaanaam aksharam brahma tat param, abhayam titeershataam paaram*" describing the one in the cave of heart as not just *Brahma* but *param brahma* and also refers him as *setu*. It is known through the vedic statements like "*esha setur vidhritih*" that the one who is described as *setu* and the one who is *abhaya* (fearless and the one removes fear from others) is *Vishnu* alone. The objection that *Vishnu* being one cannot be considered as the subject of the referred statement that speaks of two persons is also not correct. For, *Brihatsamhita* says "*aatmaa antaraatmaa iti harir eka eva dwidhaa sthitah* – The single *hari* stays as both *aatmaa* and *antaraatmaa*". Though *Vishnu* is one, he stays with his two forms and hence is counted as two. *Paadma puraana* says "*shubham pibatyasou nityam naashubham sa harih*

pibet – *Hari* consumes only the good at all times but never the bad ones” thus confirming consumption by *Vishnu*. Hence him not taking the results of *karma* does not pose an opposition for *Vishnu* consuming the benefits. The vedic statement speaking of not consuming anything speaks of him as not consuming the bad things alone. Hence the two individuals referred to as consuming the good results are two forms of *Vishnu* only

The benefit of this chapter lies in clearing the objection over the conclusion of the previous chapter on *Vishnu* being the all-eater. Further details in the matter can be seen in *chandrika* (*Tatparya chandrika* written by Sri Vyaasaraaja swamiji).

॥ ॐ अंतर उपपत्तेः ॐ ॥ ४ ॥

antara upapatteh - 4

॥ ॐ स्थानादिव्यपदेशाच्च ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ सुखविशिष्टाभिधानादेव च ॐ ॥

॥ ॐ श्रुतोपनिषत्कगत्यभिधानाच्च ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ अनवस्थितेरसम्भवाच्चनेतरः ॐ ॥

sthaanaadi-vyapadeshaaccha; sukha-visishta-abhidhaanaad-eva cha; shruto-panishat-kagaty-abhidhaanaaccha; anavasthiter-asambhavaaccha-netarah;

अत्र चक्षुरन्तस्थस्याभयस्यान्यत्वे प्राचीनोऽप्यभयत्वेनोक्तोऽन्यः स्यादिति पूर्वोक्ताक्षेपात्संगतिः । छांदोग्ये चतुर्थेऽध्याये "य एषोऽंतरक्षिणि पुरुषो दृश्यते एष आत्मेति होवाच एतदमृतमभयमेतद्ब्रह्म" इति श्रुतोऽक्ष्यन्तस्थ आत्मा किमग्निरुत विष्णुरिति संदेहः । अग्निरिति पूर्वः पक्षः य एष आदित्ये पुरुषः सोऽहमस्मि स एवाहमस्मीति गार्हपत्याख्याग्निना स्वात्मनः आदित्यस्थत्वोक्तेः आदित्यश्चक्षुर्भूत्वेत्यादिश्रुत्या अक्ष्यादित्ययोरेकदैवत्यत्वात् अथ हाग्रयः समूदिर इत्यग्निश्रुतिबाहुल्याच्च । न च "स यश्चायं पुरुषे यश्चासावादित्ये स एक" (तै. २-२९१) इत्यादिसमाख्याबलादग्निप्रयुक्तोऽहंशब्दः तत्स्थविष्णुपर इति वाच्यम् । सोऽहमस्मि स एवाहमस्मीत्यभ्यासेन समाख्याबाधात् । अपहते

पापकृत्यामुपवयंतं भुंजाम इत्यादर्थवादबलेनात्यलौकिकविष्णुग्रहणे
अपूर्वत्वमित्यस्यापि बाधादिति ॥

There is one person who is described as “*abhaya*” and he is said to be staying in the eyes. If this *abhaya* is not *Vishnu*, then it follows that the one who is referred to as *abhaya* in the previous chapter (*brahma tat param, abhayam*) would also be not *Vishnu*. Since this chapter deals with the said objection on the conclusion of previous chapter, it has a sequence of objection with the previous chapter.

In the fourth chapter of *Chandogya upanishat* we get to hear “*ya esho antarakshini purusho drishyate esha aatma iti hovaacha etadamritam abhayam etad brahma* – The person who is seen in the eyes is *aatma*. He is *amrita, abhaya* and *brahma*”. Whether this resident *aatma* is the deity *agni* or *Vishnu* is the question.

Poorvapaksha – He is the deity *agni*. For, *gaarhapatya agni* (one of the fires in a *yajna* – the name also refers to the deity controlling the said fire) says “that person who stays in Sun is me”. As could be known from the vedic text like “*aadhityah chakshur bhootvaa*”, the regulating deity for eyes and Sun is one and the same. Thus it transpires that the deity residing in eyes is *agni*. The chapter where the referred text is seen also has many statements like “*atha ha agnayah samoodire*” indicating that the subject matter of that chapter is the deity *agni*.

It should not be said that the one who is staying in the Sun is *Vishnu* and not *Agni* based on the matching expression in *taittireeya Upanishat* “The one who is in men and the one who is in Sun are one and the same”. For, this is barred by the repetitive expression of *agni* “*so aham asmi, sa eva ahamasmi* – He is me, He is me alone”. This apart, the expressions of the benefits of shredding the sins and attaining *moksha* also stand in support of

considering the person as *Agni* and oppose considering the meaning as *Vishnu* on account of it being *apoorva* (extraordinary).

सिद्धांतस्तु ॥ एतदमृतमित्यादिनोक्तामृतत्वादेः परिम्रियंते विद्युद्वृष्टिश्चन्द्रमा आदित्योऽग्निः, भयादग्निस्तपतीत्यादिना मृत्यादिमत्यग्रावायोगात् । ब्रह्मात्मशब्दयोर्विष्णोरन्यत्रानवकाशात् तदस्मिन् सर्पिर्वोदकं वा सिंचति वर्त्मनी एव गच्छतीत्युक्तादक्ष्णोऽसंगत्वापादकत्वसंयद्ब्रामत्वादिलिंगात् कं ब्रह्म खंब्रह्मेत्युक्तब्रह्मप्रकरणात् स एनान् ब्रह्म गमयति इत्युपसंहारे श्रुतैतद्विधानां ब्रह्मगत्याख्यलिङ्गश्रवणेन प्रकरणविच्छेदायोगादग्निप्रयुक्ताहंशब्दस्य च पादान्त्य-प्राणनयन्यायेन अन्तर्यामिपरत्वेन अभ्यासार्थवादयोरपि तन्निष्ठत्वात् अग्रेरपि जीवत्वेन प्रेरकजीवांतरापेक्षायामनवस्थापत्तेश्च स्वतन्त्रो विष्णुरेवाक्षिस्थ इति ॥ फले तु अयमक्षिस्थो विष्णोरन्यश्चेत् तस्यैवादित्यस्थत्वात् यश्चासावादित्य इत्युक्तोऽपि स एवेत्यानन्दमयोऽप्यन्य इति तदाक्षेपसमाधी ॥ ४ ॥

The one staying in Sun is described as the one who is immortal. Whereas *Agni* is said to be meeting death “*parimriyante vidyut vrishtih chandramaa aadityo agnih* – the deities of lightning, rain, moon, Sun and *Agni* will all die”. Another expression says *Agni* burns out of fear. Hence *Agni* cannot be the one who is in the Sun. The words “*Brahma*” and “*aatma*” used to describe the one in Sun have an exclusive reference to *Vishnu*. The description that on account of the presence of this person in the eyes, anything falling on the eyes, butter or water, slips away but does not enter the eyes and the description that on account of his presence in the eyes, women look beautiful and men majestic, do indicate him to be *Vishnu*. The chapter (*Chandogya Upanishat* – 4-15) in which these expressions are appearing pertain to *Brahma* as can be seen from other expressions thereat like “*kam brahma, kham brahma*”. This also stands in support of considering him to be *Vishnu*. In the same chapter at the conclusion, it is said “*sa enaan brahma gamayati* – he will send these *jeevas* (who have practiced this *vidya*) to *Brahma*”. This also confirms the subject being *Brahma* and not

Agni. Those who practice a particular *vidya* would get only its relevant deity and not others. If someone is getting *Brahma* by practicing this *vidya*, it clearly means that the subject of this *vidya* is *Brahma*. Sometimes, it so happens that a chapter will be discussing one deity or aspect and incidentally it speaks of others as well. No such thing is found here in this chapter to infer *Agni* being referred to here.

Well, the statement of *Agni* that he is himself the one who is staying in the eyes would only mean a reference to the one who is staying within him and regulating him – *Vishnu*. This meaning can be derived from the maxims explained in the chapter “*pranastathaa anugamaat*”. The repetitive expressions and the expression of the benefit are all referring to the one who is staying in *Agni*. *Agni* being a *jeeva*, cannot be an independent regulator. If that were to be, *Agni* should also be having another *jeeva* as his regulator on account of himself being a *jeeva* and the chain would go open ended (Defect of *Anavasthaa*). Hence it is only the independent *Vishnu* who stays in eyes and Sun and regulates them all.

The benefit of this chapter lies in resolving the doubt that if the one who is staying in eyes is not *Vishnu* the one described in the earlier chapter “*aanandamayo abhyaasaat*”, as the one staying in Sun, should also be someone other than *Vishnu*.

॥ ॐ अन्तर्याम्यधिदैवादिषु तद्धर्मव्यपदेशात् ॐ ॥ ५ ॥

Antaryaam-yadhi-daivaadishu tad-dharma-vyapadeshaat- 5

॥ ॐ न च स्मार्तमतद्धर्माभिलापात् ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ शरीरश्चोभयेऽपि हि भेदेनैनमधीयते ॐ ॥

na cha smaartam-ataddharmaabhilaapaat; shaareerashch-obhayepi hi bhedainenam-adheeyate;

अत्रामृतत्वमुखेन आक्षेपात् आक्षेपिकी संगतिः । वाजसनेये पंचमेऽध्याये “एष त आत्मा अन्तर्याम्यमृत” (बृ. ५-७-२) इति श्रुतः अन्तर्यामी किं प्रकृतिजीवौ वा उत विष्णुरितिसंदेहः । प्रकृतिरित्येकः पूर्वः पक्षः । यस्य पृथिवी शरीरमित्यादिना श्रुतपृथिव्याद्यात्मकत्वरूपपृथिव्यादिशरीरकत्वस्य सर्वोपादाने प्रकृतौ संभवात् । शरीरपदस्य “पूर्वपक्षस्य शरीर”मित्यादौ स्वरूपेऽपि संभवात् । “व्याप्तं कार्येषु कारण”मित्यादिना कारणस्य कार्यस्थत्वेन यः पृथिव्यां तिष्ठन्नित्यादेरप्युपपत्तेः । कार्यकारणयोर्भेदाभेदेन तादात्म्यतत्त्वस्थत्वयोरविरोधात् । कार्यस्य कारणाधीनत्वेन यः पृथिवीमन्तरो यमयतीत्यादेः गौणत्वेनोपपत्तेरिति । पृथिव्यादितत्तदभिमानिजीवा एव वा तत्तदन्तर्यामीत्यन्यः । तान्प्रति पृथिव्यादेः स्थूलशरीरत्वात् । एवं च प्रकृत्यादिरेवात्रामृतोऽन्य इति प्राचीनामृतत्वं नाक्षिस्थस्य विष्णुत्वसाधकमिति ।

This chapter questions the validity of the conclusion of the previous chapter for the reason of “*amritatva*” (one being *amrita* – immortal) and hence has the sequence of objection. In the 5th *adhyaya* of *Brihadāraṇyaka upanishat*, we find a statement “*esha ta aatmaa antaryāmyamritah*” referring to the one dwelling in everything as *amrita*. Whether this person is *prakṛiti* (the inert material and its regulating deity), *jeeva* or *Vishnu* is the question.

Poorvapaksha – The referred person is *Prakṛiti* (the basic matter). The referred *upanishat* describes the one who is “*antaryāmyamritah*” as having *prithivi* (earth) as his body (*yasya prithivi shareeram*). This description fits in *Prakṛiti* that is the raw material (*upaadaana kaarana*) for everything. The word “*shareeram*” can also be taken to mean *swaroopa* (ones nature) as is found in the usage “*poorvapakshasya shareeram* – the substance of *poorvapaksha*”). There is another reason – the rule *vyaaptam kaaryeshu kaaranam* (the cause remains spread across its effect) also indicates the presence of *prakṛiti* in everything derived out of it. Though it is said that the cause and effect are no different, their

relationship (*bhedaabheda*) supports the cause being considered as staying in its effect. Since the effect is dependent on its cause, even the vedic expression “*yah prithivyaam antaro yamayati* – the one who regulates *prithivi* from within” also fits in. The term regulates should be taken here as *gouna* – symbolic (on account of the inert *prithivi* being incapable of regulating anybody).

The words *prithivi* etc can also be taken to mean their respective regulating deities. After all, the referred *prithivi* etc are but the physical bodies of the respective deities. Hence the one referred to as *amrita* is *prithivi* etc and not *Vishnu*, who is referred to as the one staying in the eyes in the last chapter.

सिद्धांतस्तु ॥ यं पृथिवी न वेद यः पृथिवीमन्तरो यमयतीत्यादिनोक्तस्य कात्स्न्येन पृथिव्यादिदेवाविदितत्वस्य बाह्यापेक्षां विना यस्तु रमते सोऽन्तरः स्मृतः इति बाह्यापेक्षां विना रममाणत्वरूपांतरत्वस्य च लिङ्गस्य “न ते विष्णो जायमानः” (ऋ.७-९९-२) “स योऽतोऽश्रुतोऽगतोऽमतोऽदृष्टः सर्वेषां भूतानामन्तरपुरुषः” इत्यादिश्रुत्या (ऐ, १-२-४) विष्ण्वेकधर्मत्वात् पृथिव्यादेः जडत्वे अप्रसक्तनिरासप्रसंगात् यमित्यस्य वैयर्थ्याच्च । शरीरत्वस्य शीर्यत इति शरीरमिति योगेन वा शरीरवदीशनियम्यत्वेन गौण्या वृत्त्या वा युक्तत्वेन यः पृथिव्यामित्यादेः क्लेशेनानेयत्वात् । प्रकृतिजीवयोः त्रिगुणत्वसंसारित्वाद्य-साधारणधर्माभावात् “य आत्मनोऽन्तरो विज्ञानादन्तरो विविक्त” इति जीवादन्तर्यामिणो भेदव्यपदेशाच्च अन्तर्यामी विष्णुरेवेत्यमृतत्वमपि तस्यैवेति । फले तु पूर्वाक्षेपसमाधी ॥ ५ ॥

The referred *upanishat* that describes the one staying in everything as *amrita* explains him as the one who is not knowable by *prithivi* - the one who cannot be known fully by *prithivi* (its deity). The word *antara* means the one who enjoys without the need of anything external. This quality is unique to *Vishnu* as can be seen in the vedic texts “*na te vishno jaayamanah*”, “*sa yo ato ashruto*

agato..” etc. Since *prithivi* etc are inert objects, it is irrelevant to speak of *prithivi*, the inert matter knowing or not knowing anyone. Hence their respective deities are to be considered here by the said names of *prithivi* etc.

The reference that *prithivi* is his *shareera* – the word which would ordinarily mean a body is to be understood differently. The word *Shareera* can also mean the one that gets destroyed by someone. *Prithivi* is his *shareera* means it is the one that gets destroyed by him (*Vishnu*). Another, but secondary meaning of *shareera* is that it is something that is under his control. This also suits well. Hence there is no difficulty in interpreting the statement “*prithivi* is his *shareera*”.

Since the qualities that are specific to *prakriti* and *jeeva* like “being a formation of the three qualities (of *satva*, *rajas* and *tamas*)” and “being bound to *samsaara* (the cycle of births and deaths)” are not mentioned here and that the description “*ya aatmano antarah vijnaanaad antaro viviktah*”, makes it clear the referred person dwelling in *jeeva* as his regulator is different from *jeeva*. Thus the said regulator is none other than *Vishnu* and that he is the one who is immortal.

The benefit of this chapter lies in resolving the objection of the *poorvapaksha*.

॥ ॐ अदृश्यत्वादिगुणको धर्मोक्तेः ॐ ॥ ६ ॥

Adrishyatv-aadi-gunako dharmokteh – 6

॥ ॐ विशेषणभेदव्यपदेशाभ्यां च नेतरौ ॐ ॥ ॐ रूपोपन्यासाच्च ॐ ॥
visheshana-bheda-vyapadeshaa-bhyaam cha netarou; roopo-panyaasaa-ccha;

अत्र “यं पृथिवी न वेदे”त्युक्तादृश्यत्वाख्यप्राचीनहेत्वाक्षेपात्संगतिः । आथर्वणे “द्वे विद्ये वेदितव्ये” इत्युपक्रम्य “अथ परा यया तदक्षरमधिगम्यते” “यत्तदद्रेश्यमग्राह्यमगोत्रमवर्णम्” इत्यादिनोक्तादृश्यत्वादिगुणकं अक्षरात्संभवतीह विश्वमिति विश्वकारणतया श्रुतमक्षरं किं चिदचित्प्रकृतिविरिंचिरुद्राः उत विष्णुरिति सदेहः । “यथा पृथिव्यामोषधय” इत्युपादानदृष्टान्तबलेनाबाधेन अन्तरङ्गत्यागायोगेन च अक्षरादिति श्रुतोपादानत्वरूपकारणत्वलिङ्गात् जडप्रकृतिरित्येकः पूर्वः पक्षः ॥

This chapter questions having “unknowable” as the *hetu*, the reason in the logic used in the previous chapter with the words “*yam prithivi na veda*”. Hence has the sequential reference of objection with the previous chapter.

A description in *Mundakopanishat* begins with “*dve vidye veditavye* – there are two *vidyas* to be learnt” and later says “*yat tad adreshyam agraahyam..*” meaning that this universe is created by the one named *akshara* who cannot be known. Whether this *akshara* is anyone amongst *chitprakriti* (goddess Lakshmi), *achitprakriti* (inert matter), *virinchi* (*chaturmukha brahma*) and *Rudra* or *Vishnu* is the question.

One *poorvapaksha* says this creator of the universe is core inert matter, for this is the one that forms the raw material as explained with the uncontested illustration of how plants grow from the earth. Since the raw material goes into the creation, there is no contradiction in considering the core inert matter as staying within the universe. The statement “*aksharaat sambhavateeha vishwam* – this universe is created by *akshara*” also fits in as the core material is goes into the formation of the universe. Hence the core matter is the creator of this universe.

“कूटस्थोऽक्षर उच्यते” इति स्मृतावक्षरपदस्य श्रीतत्त्वे प्रयोगादुपादानाभिमानित्वेन उपादानत्वस्यापि संभवाच्चित्प्रकृतिरित्यन्यः । “स ब्रह्मविद्याम्” इत्युपक्रमे ब्रह्मशब्दाच्चतुर्मुखो वा कर्तारमीशमित्यतुरत्रेशपदश्रवणाद्बुद्धौ वेत्यपरौ । न चाक्षरादिशब्दा विष्णौ सावकाशाः । अक्षरात्परतः पर इत्युत्कर्षविधितया निर्देशेनोक्ताक्षरस्य निकृष्टत्वेन विष्णुत्वायोगात् । अत एव च कारणत्वमात्रे अक्षरात्सम्भवतीति पञ्चमीति प्रत्युक्तम् । चित्प्रकृतिपक्षे अक्षरात्परत इति पञ्चम्योः सामानाधिकरण्येन पक्षान्तरेषु वैयधिकरण्येनोपपत्तेरिति ॥

The name “*akshara*” refers to goddess Lakshmi as could be seen from the expression “*koothasthokshara uchyate*” in *Bhagavad Geeta*. She is also the regulating deity of the inert matter and hence gets referred to by that name. Hence when core matter is referred to as the raw material, it also refers to its regulating deity *Lakshmi*. Hence *Lakshmi* is the creator of the universe. The chapter where the subject of creation has been discussed in the referred upanishat, has a mention “*sa brahmavidyaam*” referring to *Chaturmukha* with the word *Brahma* and has a statement “*kartaaram eesham*” in its concluding part referring to *eesha – rudra*. Hence either of them can be counted as creator of the universe. The reference of *akshara* does not lead to consider the creator as *Vishnu*. For, *Vishnu* is referred to as “*aksharaat paratah parah* – He is superior to the one who is superior to *akshara*”. *Vishnu* cannot be considered by the name “*akshara*”, that is counted as two levels inferior to the supreme. By this, the argument that the expression “*aksharaat sambhavateeha vishwam*” speaks only of a generic cause is also discarded. When *Lakshmi* is referred to by the name “*akshara*”, the one referred to as *akshara* in “*aksharaat paratah*” is to be interpreted to mean “*paratah*” as a qualifier to “*aksharaat*” meaning “superior to *akshara*, the superior *Lakshmi*”. In other cases like *Chaturmukha*, it would be “superior to the one who is superior to *akshara*, *Chaturmukha*”.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ “अथ परा यया स हरिर्वेदितव्यः” “सा विद्या तन्मतिर्यया” (भा. ४) इत्यादिश्रुतिस्मृतिभिः विष्णवेकनिष्ठऋगादिपरविद्याविषयत्वरूपतद्धर्मात् । “यदा पश्यः पश्यते रुग्मवर्णम्” इति रूपोपन्यासात् । अन्येषां “विमिश्राणि व्यमिश्रयत्” इत्यादिश्रुत्या मिश्ररूपत्वेन शुद्धरूपस्य तदेकनिष्ठत्वात् । अक्षरत्रयमीरितमितिस्मृत्या (स्कान्द. पु.) परावधित्वेनोक्ताक्षरस्यान्यत्वेनाविष्णुतया परावधित्वेन निर्देशस्याबाधकत्वात् । पृथिव्यादिदृष्टान्तस्य कारणत्वमात्रे तात्पर्यसम्भवात् । ब्रह्मेशादिशब्दस्य विष्णावेव मुख्यत्वात् । जडपक्षे यः सर्वज्ञ इत्युक्तसार्वज्ञरूपविशेषणायोगात् । “तस्मादेतद्ब्रह्मनामरूपमन्नं च जायत” इति “जुष्टं यदा पश्यत्यन्यमीशम्” इति ब्रह्मरुद्रयोरक्षराद्वेदव्यपदेशाच्च अदृश्यत्वादिगुणकं परतः परत्वेन श्रुतमक्षरं विष्णुरेवेति ॥ फले तु अदृश्यत्वादिगुणयुक्तानन्दमयाक्षेपतत्समाधी ॥ ६ ॥

The one described as having the qualities of non-knowability and as superior to the superiors is none other than *Vishnu* for the following reasons:

He has been stated as the subject matter of the sacred texts of *Rigveda* etc in various *sruti* and *smritis* like “*atha paraa yayaa sa harirveditavyah*” and “*saa vidyaa tan-matir-mama*”.

He has been described as the one having pure color in the *vedas* as “*yadaa pashyah pashyate rugmavarnam*” while others have admixture of colors “*vimishrena vyamishrayat*”.

The one referred to as *akhsara* in the statement “*aksharaat paratah parah* – He is superior to the one who is superior to *akshara*” is a different entity and hence does not pose any contradiction.

The illustration of plants growing from earth has a limited scope of explaining the cause and not the specificity of being the raw material.

The words “*brahma*”, “*eesha*” speak of *Vishnu* in their primary sense.

The inert matter has no intelligence and hence does not fit into the description of being *sarvajna* – omniscient.

Chaturmukha Brahma and *Rudra* are described as different from *akshara* through the statements “*tasmaadetad brahma naama-roopam-annam cha jaayate*”, “*jushtham yadaa pashaty-anyam-eesham*” etc.

The benefit of this chapter lies in raising a doubt on whether the one described as *adrishya* and *aanandamaya* is *Vishnu* or not and its resolution.

॥ ॐ वैश्वानरः साधारणशब्दविशेषात् ॐ ॥ ७ ॥

vaishvaanarah saadhaarana-shabda-visheshaat – 7

॥ ॐ स्मर्यमाणमनुमानं स्यादिति ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ शब्दादिभ्योऽन्तःप्रतिष्ठानान्नेति चेन्न तथा दृष्ट्युपदेशादसम्भवात्पुरुषविधमपि चैनमधीयते ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ अत एव न देवता भूतं च ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ साक्षादप्यविरोधं जैमिनिः ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ अभिव्यक्तेरित्याश्मरथ्यः ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ अनुस्मृतेर्बादरिः ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ सम्पत्तेरिति जैमिनिस्तथा हि दर्शयति ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ आमनन्ति चैनमस्मिन् ॐ ॥

smarya-maanam-anumaanam syaaditi; shabda-adibhyo-antah-pratishthaanaan-neti chenna tathaa drishtyupadeshaad-asambhavaat-purusha-vidhamapi-chainam-adheeyate; ata eva na devataa bhootam cha; saakshaadap-yavirodham jaiminih; abhivyakter-ityaa-shmarathyah; anusmriter-baadarih; sampatteriti jaiminis-tathaa hi darshayati; aamananti chainam-asmin;

अत्र प्राचीनादृश्यत्वादिगुणमध्यश्रुतसर्वगतत्वाक्षेपात्सङ्गतिः । छान्दोग्ये पञ्चमे अध्याये “अभिविमानमात्मानं वैश्वानरमुपास्ते” (छां. ५-१८-१) इति वाजसनेये च सप्तमेऽध्याये “अयमग्निर्वैश्वानरो योऽयमन्तःपुरुषे येनेदमन्नं पच्यत” इति (बृ. ७-९-१) वैश्वानरविद्यागतः तथा “वैश्वानरमृत आज्ञातमग्निम्” (ऋ. ६-७-१) इत्यादिसूक्तगतो वैश्वानरः किं भूततदभिमानिदेवते वा विष्णुर्वेति

सन्देहः । वैश्वानराग्न्यादिशब्दानां अग्रावेव लोकप्रसिद्धेः । छान्दोग्ये “वैश्वानरे तद्भुतं भवति” (छां. ५-२४-४) “हृदयं गार्हपत्य” (छां. ५-१८-२) इत्यादिना श्रुतहोमाधारत्वगार्हपत्याद्यङ्गकत्वस्य काण्वश्रुतौ पाचकत्वादेश्च लिङ्गस्य श्रवणात् । तेषां च विष्णौ मुख्यत्वे लोकव्यवहारविरोधात् । सर्वविद्याया वैष्णवत्वापत्त्या इयमग्निविद्या इयमन्यविद्येत्यादिव्यवस्थायोगाच्च वैश्वानरो भूतं देवता वा । न च सिद्धान्तीयलिङ्गसमाख्याप्रकरणानां बाहुल्यात् निरवकाशत्वाच्च अग्निरेवेत्यनिर्णयः इति शङ्क्यम् । श्रुतेः स्वभावतो बलवत्त्वात् तावतापि अभिविमानपदेन अभितो विगतं मानं मर्यादा यस्येत्युक्तसर्वगतस्य वैश्वानरस्य अनिर्णये प्राचीनं सर्वगतमिति श्रुतमक्षरमपि विष्णुरेवेति सिद्धान्त्यभिमतनिर्णयायोगः इति पूवः पक्षः ॥

This chapter questions the attribute “omnipresence” as arising out of the many qualities described in the previous chapter incidental to the attribute of being *adrishya* – unknowable. Hence this has a sequence of objection with the previous chapter.

In the fifth *adhyaya* of *Chandogya upanishat* we find “*abhivimaanam aatmaanam vaishvaanaram upaaste*” and in the seventh *adhyaya* of *Brihadaraanyaka Upanishat* “*ayam agnir vaishvaanaro yo ayam antah purushe..*” and in the Rig Veda “*vaishvaanaram rita aajaatamagnim*”. Whether the one referred to as *Vaishvaanara* in all these places is *Agni*, the deity in charge of the physical fire or *Vishnu* is the question.

The referred *Vaishvaanara* is considered as part of *homa* (sacrificial fire) in the form of *gaarhapatya* (one of the multiple fires in a *yajna*) etc in *Chandogya upanishat* and as the one who causes digestion in *Brihadaraanyaka upanishat*. It would contradict the usage if we are to consider this *Vaishvaanara* to be *Vishnu*. If the one appearing in *Vishvaanara vidya* (section dealing with *Vaishvaanara*) is to be considered as *Vishnu* and consequently the said *Vidya* as pertaining to him, then on the same

logic every *Vidya* should get counted as of *Vishnu* and there should not have been different identifications as “this is *agni vidya*”, “this is *varuna vidya*” and “this is some other *vidya*”. Hence *Vaishwaanara* should mean either the physical fire or its deity. In view of the *siddhaanta* providing *linga* (indicators) and *samaakhya* (matching descriptions in other texts) in favor *Vaishwaanara* being considered as *Vishnu* and though they are in large numbers and are *niravakaasha* (non-accomadative) it can be said that there cannot be a conclusion that *Vaishwaanara* is *Agni* alone. However, since *sruti* (vedic expression) is considered as the most powerful of the indicators and it is in favour of *Agni*. If there can be no conclusion on *Vaishwaanara*, who is described as *abhivimaanam* (the one who has no bounds – omnipresent), then the earlier conclusion of *akshara* who is also described as omnipresent being *Vishnu* would also go for a toss.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ आत्मानमिति श्रुतात्मशब्दादभिविमानामित्युक्तसर्वगतत्व-
लिङ्गादहं वैश्वानरो भूत्वेति स्मृतिसमाख्यानात् “को न आत्मा किं ब्रह्म” इति
विचारपूर्वकमुपक्रम्यैतद्विद्याया अधीतत्वेन ब्रह्मप्रकरणत्वात् शीर्ष्णो द्यौः
समवर्ततेति पुरुषसूक्तोक्तस्य द्युरादिजनकशीर्षाद्यवयवकस्यैव मूर्ध्वं सुतेजा
इत्यर्थतोऽत्र विद्यायामुक्त्या पुरुषसूक्तसमाख्यानाच्च निरवकाशसाधकसद्भावात्,
वैश्वानरादिशब्दानां अग्न्यादिलिङ्गानां च तथोपासनार्थतया ईशे सावकाश-
त्वाद्विष्णौ मुख्यानामपि शब्दानां अनन्यगतिकतया शब्दाधीनहानादिव्यव-
हारसिद्ध्यर्थमन्यत्रव्यवहाराविरोधात् । अग्न्यादिविद्यादिभिः ब्रह्मोपासनया
अग्न्यादावेव विष्णोः व्यक्तत्वानुस्मरणीयत्वप्राप्यत्वरूपनिमित्तैः विद्यादि-
व्यवस्थोपपत्तेः । बाधकाभावाद्वैश्वानरो विष्णुरेवेति प्राचीनोऽपि स एवेति ॥ फले
तु पूर्वक्षेपसमाधी ॥ ७ ॥

॥ इति श्रीराघवेन्द्रयतिकृतायां न्यायमुक्तावल्यां आद्येऽध्याये द्वितीयः पादः ॥

The word *Vaishwaanara* speaks of *Vishnu* alone, for:

The text speaking of *Vaishwaanara* speaks of him to be *aatma*, the expression that suits *Vishnu* alone. (*sruti*)

The description of him being *abhivimaanam* – omnipresent is a clear *linga*, indication of *Vishnu*. (*linga*)

Krishna himself says that he digests the food consumed by all by being *Vaishwaanara* in *Bhagavad Geeta*. (*samaakhya*)

The referred *Vaishwaanara vidya* begins with “*ko na aatmaa kim brahma*” and hence it is *Brahma prakarana* (section dealing with *Brahma*). (*prakaranam*)

This *vaishwaanara vidya* speaks of *Vaishwaanara* as having “*moordhaiva sutejaah*” that has a similar meaning with what is expressed in *purusha sookta* as “*sheershnou dyouh samavartata*” - the head being the creator of *dyuloka* and that *purusha sookta* speaks of *Vishnu* alone is uncontested.

The words *Vaishwaanarana* etc and the *linga* indicating *agni* are all *saavakaasha* referring to *Vishnu* as well and are meant to facilitate *upaasana* of *Vishnu* as such. While these words are primarily oriented towards *Vishnu*, left with no choice, they are used to refer to other deities to facilitate the worldly activities, which are dependent on the names. Hence there is no contradiction. The reasons for separate identification for the texts as *agni vidya*, *varuna vidya* etc, though they are meant for *upaasana* of *Vishnu* are as under:

Vishnu manifests in the said objects of *Agni* etc.

It is easy to remember *Vishnu* through those media.

Vishnu is the destination for the deities of *Agni* etc.

Thus, with no contradiction, it gets concluded that *Vaishwaanara* is *Vishnu* alone and that the one referred to as *adrishya* is also him. The benefit of this lies in the aforesaid objection and its resolution.

प्रथमाध्याये तृतीयः पादः

एवम् अन्यत्रप्रसिद्धाशेषनामलिङ्गसमन्वयं महामल्लभङ्गन्यायेन पूर्वमुक्त्वा अत्र उभयत्रप्रसिद्धनामलिङ्गसमन्वयः क्रियते ॥

After thus completing the *samanvaya* of the names and *lingas* that are known to exist with others – other than *Vishnu*, by adopting the rule of hitting the strongest first, this section now deals with those names and indicators (*linga*) that are known to refer both *Vishnu* and others.

॥ ॐ द्युभ्वाद्यायतनं स्वशब्दात् ॐ ॥ १ ॥

dyu-bhvaady-aayatanaṁ sva-shabdaat – 1

॥ ॐ मक्तोपसृप्यव्यपदेशात् ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ नानुमानमतच्छब्दात् ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ प्राणभृच्च ॐ ॥

mukto-pasripya-vyapadeshaat; naanumaanam-atacchabdaat; praana-bhritccha;

पूर्वेण नावश्यं सङ्गत्यपेक्षेत्यवोचाम । आथर्वणे “यस्मिन्द्यौः पृथिवी चान्तरिक्षमोतं मनः सह प्राणैश्च सर्वैः । तमेवैकं जानथ आत्मान”मिति (मुं. २-२-५) श्रुतं द्युभ्वाद्यायतनं किं विष्णुः उत रुद्रादिरिति सन्देहः । रुद्रः प्रधानं वायुः जीवो वेति पूर्वः पक्षः । “रुद्रो वाव लोकाधारः” “प्राणानां ग्रन्थिरसि रुद्रो माविशान्तकः” (महाना.) “प्राणेश्वरः कृत्तिवासाः पिनाकी” (घृत.सू.) “यदूर्ध्वं गार्गि दिवो यदर्वाक् पृथिव्या यदन्तरा द्यावापुथिवी इमे यद्भूतञ्च भवच्च भविष्यच्चेत्याचक्षते आकाश एव तदोतं च प्रोतं चेति” (बृ. ५-८-७) “वायुना वै गौतम सूत्रेणायं च लोकः परश्च लोकः सर्वाणि च भूतानि सन्दृब्धानि”ति (बृ. ५-७-२) यथाक्रमं त्रिषु समाख्यानात् । “स एषोऽन्तश्चरते बहुधा जायमान” इति (मुं. ४-६) जायमानत्वरूपजीवलिङ्गाच्च । लोकाश्च लोकिनश्च विष्णावेव ओताश्चेति विष्णुसमाख्यातोऽपि बहुरुद्रश्रुतिलिङ्गोपेतत्वेन रुद्रसमाख्यायाः प्राबल्यात् ।

निरवकाशजायमानत्वलिङ्गेन विष्णुसमाख्याया बाधाच्च । न च "अथ परा यया तदक्षरमधिगम्यत" इति परविद्याविषयत्वरूपविष्णुलिङ्गमप्यनवकाशमिति-वाच्यम् । एवं हि द्वयाविरोधेन जीवेशाभेदोऽस्तु पूर्वोक्तदिशा विष्णुलिङ्गस्य जीव इव जीवलिङ्गस्य विष्णावयोगादिति ॥

Since this is a new section, we say that there is no need to search for the sequential reference with the previous chapter.

Mundaka Upanishat speaks of someone as the guardian of the worlds of *dyu* (heaven), *bhu* (earth) etc through its *mantra* "yasmin dyouh prithivee cha antariksham otam manah saha praanaisha sarvaih". Whether this someone is *Vishnu* or *Rudra* etc is the question. The *poorvapaksha* says, it could be *Rudra*, *Pradhaanam* (core matter), *Vaayu* or *Jeeva*.

Following are the vedic expressions in support of the above:

"*rudro vaava lokaadhaarah* – Rudra is the guardian of the world and this is well known"

"*praanaanam granthirasi rudro maa visha antakah* – O! Rudra, you are the supporter of senses. You are the killer. Do not enter me".

"*praaneshwarah kritivaasaa pinaaki* – you are the lord of senses. You wear the animal skin and hold the *pinaka* bow".

"*yadoordhwam gaargi..*" - That which is above the *dyu* world, below the *prithivi* and these *dyu* and *prithivi* that stay in between them, that which existed in the past and those that would come into existence in future, everything of this is embedded in *aakaasha* (space) and *aakaasha* exists with in all of them.

"*vaayunaa vai goutama sootrena ayam..*" - O! *Goutama*, it is this *vaayu*, known by the name "*sootra*" because of

whom this world, the other worlds and all the living-beings are held in place.

While the first three are in support of *Rudra*, the other two are in favour of matter, represented by *aakaasha* (space) and *Vaayu*. The statement in *Mundaka Upanishat* “*sa esho antascharate bahudhaa jaayamaanah*” - This is the one who stays within everyone and is the one who gets born several times. This speaks of *Jeeva* on account of the feature of getting born often.

Though *veda* says “*lokaascha lokinascha vishnaaveva otaascha*” speaking of *Vishnu* being the dweller in everything, the statements in favour of *Rudra* stay stronger on account of their multiplicity. The narration of being born several times, which cannot be fitted in to *Vishnu*, who is beyond births and deaths opposes the vedic script that speaks of *Vishnu* being the one who stays in everyone. It is true that we have an unimpeachable attribute of *Vishnu* in the referred upanishat “*atha paraa yayaa tadaksharam adhigamyate*” in the form of a description that it is only *Vishnu* who is the subject of “*para vidya*” (the study that leads to *moksha*). However, in view of the two rigid qualities of being the subject matter of *para vidya* that fits only in *Vishnu* and of getting born several times that fits only in *jeeva* but not in *Vishnu*, we can consider *Vishnu* and *Jeeva* as one (*abhinna*).

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ आत्मानमित्यात्मशब्दादमृतस्यैष सेतुरिति मुक्तप्राप्यत्वरूपान-
वकाशविष्णुलिङ्गाद्बुद्धाद्यसाधारणभस्मधरोग्रादिशब्दाभावत् । समाख्यागत-
रुद्रादिशब्दानां “रुजं द्रावयते यस्माद्” इत्यादि (ब्रह्माण्डपुराणोक्त्या) स्मृत्या
वैष्णवत्वात् । जायमानत्वस्याप्यजायमानो बहुधा विजायत इति श्रुत्यन्तरबलात्
प्रादुर्भावाख्यजनिसम्भवेन च विष्णुनिषठत्वात् । द्वे विद्ये वेदितव्ये इति
परविद्याविषयतया प्रकृतेशस्यैव जुष्टं यदा पश्यत्यन्यमीशमिति जीवेन
भेदव्यपदेशेन तयोरन्यः पिप्पलं स्वाद्वत्त्यनश्नन्नन्योऽभिचाकशतीति जीवेश्योः
कर्मफलोपजीवनतद्रहितावस्थानरूप भेदकोक्त्या च तयोरैक्यायोगाद्विष्णुरेव

द्युभ्वाद्यायतनमिति ॥ फले तु द्युभ्वाद्यायतनस्य ब्रह्मान्यत्वे अदृश्यत्वादि-
गुणकाक्षरमप्यन्यदिति तदाक्षेपसमाधी ॥ १ ॥

In view of the following rigid attributes, the one staying in everyone and regulating them is to be considered as *Vishnu* alone.

The quoted vedic text has the word “*aatmaanam*”. The word *aatma* speaks primarily of *Vishnu* alone.

He is described as “*amritasya eshah setuh*” - the destiny of those attaining *moksha*.

We do not also find the attributes like “*bhasmadhara*” (one who smears ash on his body), “*Ugra*” that would have exclusively spoken of *Rudra*. The word *Rudra* also speaks of *Vishnu*, in the primary sense on account of its etymological meaning as the one who drives out the diseases. This is explained in *Brahmaanda puraana*. As regards the statement of him getting births, it refers to his *avataaras* (manifestations) as described in vedic texts as “*ajaayamaano bahudhaa vijaayate* – the one who is never born takes many births. This again is the quality of *Vishnu*. After having referred to him as the subject matter of *paravidya* in the narration “*dve vidye veditavye*”, the vedic text speaks of the benefit of knowing him as different from *jeeva* (*jushtam yadaa pasyatyanyam eesham..*). There it speaks of the difference between *Vishnu* and *jeeva* with the latter dependent on the fruits of *karma* while the former stays untainted by it. Thus, there is no room for considering them one. Hence it is only *Vishnu* who is the guardian of the earth, heaven etc.

The benefit of this chapter lies in resolving the contention that if the one who is the guardian of earth, heaven etc is not *Brahma*, the one described as having the qualities of being incognizable and referred to as *akshara* should also be not so.

॥ ॐ भूमा सम्प्रसादादध्युपदेशात् ॐ ॥ २ ॥

bhooma sam-prasaadaad-adhyupadeshaat – 2

॥ ॐ धर्मोपपत्तेश्च ॐ ॥

dharmopapatteshcha;

“स एवाधस्तात्स एवोपरिष्ठात्स पश्चात्स पुरस्तात्स दक्षिणतः स उत्तरतः स एवेदं सर्वं” (छां.७-२५-१) “यत्र नान्यत्पश्यति नान्यच्छृणोति नान्यद्विजानाति स भूमा स भगवः कस्मिन्प्रतिष्ठित इति स्वे महिम्नि इति” (छां.७-२४-१) इत्यादिना श्रुतस्य सर्वगतत्वादेर्भूमधर्मस्य “ब्रह्मैवेदममृतं पुरस्तात् ब्रह्मपश्चाद्ब्रह्म दक्षिणतः (मं. ४-१४) इत्यादिना द्युभ्वाद्ययातने श्रुतत्वात्तदाक्षेपेण पूर्वपक्षोत्थानात्सङ्गतिः । “यो वै भूमा तत्सुखमिति” (छां. ७-२३-१) छान्दोग्ये सप्तमेऽध्याये श्रुतो भूमा किं मुख्यप्राण उत विष्णुरिति सन्देहः ॥ प्राणो भूमेति पूर्वः पक्षः ॥ नाम वाक् मनः सङ्कल्प ध्यान विज्ञान बल अन्न अप् तेज आकाश स्मर आशा प्राणेषु प्रत्येकं प्रश्रप्रत्युक्तिपूर्वमुत्तरोत्तराधिक्यमुक्त्वा प्राणादूर्ध्वमस्ति प्राणाद्भूय इति प्रश्रस्य भूमा वाव प्राणाद्भूयानिति प्रत्युक्तेश्चाभावेन भूम्नः प्राणादनन्यत्वात्, विष्णुर्वा देवेभ्यो भूयानिति समाख्यायाः प्राणो वा आशाया भूयानिति उपक्रमात् दुर्बलतया तेन तद्वाधात् । उत्क्रान्तप्राणानिति प्राणे श्रुतस्योत्क्रमणलिङ्गस्य सर्वगते विष्णावयोगेन “अत एव प्राण” (ब्र. सू. १-१-२३) इति न्यायेन प्राणश्रुतेः विष्णाववकाश इत्यस्याप्ययोगादिति ॥

Chandogya Upanishat describes some one as the one who is above, who is below, who is on the right, on the left and is (controlling) everything. It also says that with reference to whom nothing else is seen, nothing else is heard, nothing else is known, he is *bhooma*, he is *bhagava* – where does he stay? He stays in his own glory. With a similar description (*Brahma* is this *amrita*, *Brahma* is in the front, *Brahma* is at the back, *Brahma* is on the right etc), *Mundaka Upanishat* refers to the one who is the

guardian of *dyu*, *bhu* etc (as discussed in the previous chapter). The discussion in this chapter begins with questioning the validity of the conclusion that *Brahma* is the guardian of everything. Whether the one referred to as “*yo vai bhooma tat sukham*” in the seventh *adhyaya* of *Chandogya Upanishat* is *Mukhya Praana* or *Vishnu* is the question.

The *Poorvapaksha* says it is *Praana* who is described as *bhooma*. The said *Upanishat* discusses the gradation in the form of a conversation where sage *Naarada* seeks to know who is the superior and there is a reply by sage *Sanatkumaara* naming someone. Who is superior to *Vaak*? It is *Naama*. Who is superior to *Naama*? It is *Manas* and so on. This discussion lists out the gradation in the ascending order as *Naama*, *Vaak*, *Manas*, *Sankalpa*, *Chitta*, *Dhyaana*, *Vijnaana*, *Bala*, *Anna*, *Ap*, *Tejas*, *Aakaasha*, *Smaara*, *Aasha* and *Praana*. (All these names speak of the deities regulating the said aspects / objects, viz. *Usha*, *Svaaha*, *Parjanya*, *Mitra*, *Agni*, *Varuna*, *Vidyhut*, *Pravaha*, *Aniruddha*, *Praana*, *Indra*, *Uma*, *Rudra*, *Vaani*, *Mukhya Praana*). The question and answers do not continue with who is superior to *Praana* and a reply that *Booma* is superior to *Praana*. Hence it deduces that *Praana* is himself *Bhooma*. Though somewhere else it is said “*Vishnur vaava devebhyo bhooyaan* – *Vishnu* is superior to the deities”, the said statement (a *samaakhya* – similar expression) is weak vis-a-vis the *upakrama* (forming part of the initial part of a section) sentence “*Praano vaa ashaayaa bhooyan*” and hence gets subdued. Moreover, the word “*Praana*” that is referred to in a statement that speaks of one who exits from the body (*utkraanta praanaan*) does not fit in to *Vishnu* who is omnipresent. To move from one place to another, he should not have been present in that place and he should be vacating the existing place on such movement. Being omnipresent at all times, this does not fit in for *Vishnu*. For the same reason, the rule in the *Sutra* “*ata eva*

praanah” that all references to *prana* point at *Vishnu* also fails here.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ निरुपपदसुखपदोक्तपूर्णसुखत्वस्य सर्वेषां नामादीनां उपरि सर्वाधिकत्वेनाम्नातत्वस्य स एवाधस्तादित्यादिनोक्तसर्वगतत्वादिधर्माणां च “विश्वशम्भुवं”, “विश्वतः परम्” इत्यादिश्रुतिभिः (महाना.उ ।) ब्रह्मैकनिष्ठत्वात् विष्णावणुत्वस्यापि वक्ष्यमाणत्वेनोत्क्रमणक्रियाया अपि युक्तत्वात् । प्राणो भूमा च विष्णुरेवेति प्राणभूमनोरभेदेन वा प्राणस्य वायुत्वेऽपि प्रश्नप्रत्युक्त्य-
ध्याहारेण प्राणभूमनोः भेदेन वा भूमा विष्णुरेवेति । फले तु सुखमित्युक्तपूर्णसुखत्वमुखेन आनन्दमयाक्षेपसमाधी ॥ २ ॥

In the quoted text “*yo vai bhooma tat sukham*”, the word “*sukha*” has been used without a qualifier. Such an expression would mean completeness. *Bhooma* is described as the one who is an embodiment of complete *sukha* (pleasure), is superior to everyone and is the one who is present above, below and everywhere. These descriptions fit only into *Vishnu* as can be seen in a matching expression in *Mahanarayana Upanishat* as “*vishwa shambhuvam* – the one who is the abode of complete *sham* - pleasure”, “*vishwatah param* – superior to everything” etc. Since the miniature size of *Vishnu* is described in the ensuing chapters, his exiting from the body etc are also not illogical. As regards the word “*praana*” appearing in the concluding part of the question-answer series referred to above, it can be understood that the said word and “*bhooma*” refer to *Vishnu* based on the conclusion in the *sootra* “*ata eva praanah*”. Alternatively, if “*praana*” is to be considered as referring to “*vaayu*”, a set of question and answers be imported (*adhyahaara*) at the end of the series to show superiority of *Vishnu*, who is none other than *bhooma* over *Praana*.

The benefit of this chapter lies in resolving the objection over the conclusion in the chapter “*anandamayo abhyaasaat*” based on the

usage of word “*sukham*” in “*yo vai bhooma tat sukham*” if *bhooma* were to speak of someone other than *Vishnu* and its resolution.

॥ ॐ अक्षरमम्बरान्तधृतेः ॐ ॥ ३ ॥

Aksharam-ambaraanta-dhriteh – 3

॥ ॐ सा च प्रशासनात् ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ अन्यभावव्यावृत्तेश्च ॐ ॥

saa cha prashaasa-naat; anya-bhaava-vyaavrittesh-cha;

पूर्वत्रैकप्रकरणस्थयोः सर्वगतत्वोत्क्रमणयोः विरोधनिरासोऽत्र त्वेकवाक्यस्थयोः अणुत्वमहत्त्वयोर्विरोधो निरस्यत इति सङ्गतिः । काण्वशाखायां पञ्चमेऽध्याये अष्टमब्राह्मणे “एतद्वैतदक्षरं गार्गी ब्राह्मणा अभिवदन्त्यस्थूलमनण्वहस्वमि”त्या-दिना (बृ. ५-८-८) श्रुतमक्षरं किं चित्परकृतिरुत विष्णुरिति सन्देहः । अक्षरशब्दस्य ये त्वक्षरमनिर्देश्यमित्यादौ (भ.गी. १२-३) श्रीतत्त्वे प्रयोगादविनाशित्वरूपनिमित्तसत्त्वात् अहं सोममाहनसं बिभर्मीति श्रुत्यन्तरे श्रीतत्त्वधर्मतया श्रुतस्य चन्द्राद्याधारत्वस्येह सूर्याचन्द्रमसौ विधृतौ तिष्ठत इति श्रवणाददृष्टं द्रष्टृश्रुतं श्रोतृ इत्यादिनोक्तादृश्यत्वादेश्च ये त्वक्षरमित्यादिस्मृत्या श्रीतत्त्वेऽपि सम्भवान्न तदश्राति किञ्चनेत्युक्तानशनस्य “अत्ते” (ब्र.सू. १-२-९)त्यत्रातृत्वेनोक्तविष्णावयोगात् । किञ्चनेत्युक्त्या गुहानयोक्तन्यायेन (ब्र. सू. १-२-११) अशुभानशनपरत्वस्याप्ययोगात् । श्रीतत्त्वे च स्वतन्त्राशनाभावादिनोपपत्तेः चित्पकृतिरेवेदं अक्षरमित पूर्वः पक्षः ॥

While the conflict of one being omnipresent and exiting as appearing in the same section is resolved in the previous chapter, the conflict of the same person being of miniature size and of huge size as appearing in the same sentence is being resolved in this chapter. Thus this chapter has the sequence of continuity with the previous one.

We find a description, in the 8th *Brahmana* of 5th *adhyaya* of *Brihadaraanya Upanishat*, of someone named *akshara* as the one

who is neither big nor small, neither short nor long etc. Whether this *akshara* is *chitprakriti* (goddess Lakshmi) or *Vishnu* is the confusion. As could be seen in *Bhagavadgeeta*, in its 13th *adhyaya*, the word *akshara* refers to *sree tatva* (goddess Lakshmi). The literal meaning of the word that the person is devoid of any loss or mutation also fits in here. In some other *sruti*, *Lakshmi* is described as (*aham somam aahanasam bibharmi*) the one who supports *chandra* (moon) and *aahanasam* (the weed whose juice is used in *yajna*). The present *upanishat* also speaks of *akshara* as the one who is the support of Sun and Moon (*sooryaachandramasau vidhrutou tishtatah*). The qualities of *adrishtam drashtrasrutam srotr* describing *akshara* as unknowable are also matching the description “*ye tvaksharam anirdeshyam*” in *Bhagavad Geeta*. While this is so for considering *akshara* as *Lakshmi*, the quality of not eating anything (*na tad asnaati kinchana*) does not fit in for *Vishnu*, who is described as the one who eats everything – fixed and mobile. Though it is said in the *sootra* “*guhaam pravishtou..*” that *Vishnu* is considered as a non-eater since he does not consume anything bad the word “*kinchana* – anything” makes it clear that non-eating does not have a limited meaning here. Since *sritatva* does not consume anything independently, the attribute of non-eating of anything fits in here. Hence the word “*akshara*” refers to *Chit prakriti (Lakshmi)* alone.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ यद्भूतं च भवच्च भविष्यच्चेत्याचक्षते आकाश एव तदोतमिति सर्वाधारत्वमाकाशशब्दितश्रीतत्त्वेऽभिधाय अक्षरे गार्ग्याकाशओतश्च प्रोतश्चेत्युक्त-
सर्वाधाराकाशशब्दितचित्प्रकृत्याः आकाशाख्यप्रकृतेः सर्वाधारत्वमुक्त्वा
एतस्मिन् खल्वक्षरे गार्गी आकाश ओतश्च प्रोतश्चेति तदाधारत्वस्यैतस्य वा
अक्षरस्य प्रशासने गार्गीत्यादिनोक्तस्य असङ्कुचितविषयत्वानन्यायत्तत्त्वरूप-
प्रकर्षयुक्तसर्वशासनलिङ्गस्य अस्थूलमनष्वित्यादिनोक्तस्य अन्यानपेक्षप्राकृत-
स्थौल्याद्यभावस्य स्थौल्यादिविरुद्धाणुत्वमहत्वादेर्वा लिङ्गस्य एको दाधार
भुवनानि, सप्तार्धगर्भा भुवनस्य रेतो विष्णोस्तिष्ठन्ति प्रदिशेति अस्थूलोऽन-

णुरमध्यमो मध्यमो व्यापकोऽव्यापक इत्यादिश्रुत्या विष्णवेकनिष्ठत्वात्
 “अनित्यत्वं देहहानिः” इत्यादिश्रुत्या चतुर्विधनाशहीने विष्णावेवाक्षरपद-
 प्रवृत्तिनिमित्तपौष्कल्यात् तस्मादक्षरं तस्मादक्षरमितिप्रयोगाच्चाक्षरं विष्णुरेव ।
 अनशनश्रुतिस्तु जीवस्वभावभूतोपजीवनार्थाशननिषेधपरा, अणुत्वमहत्वादिकं
 चाचिन्त्यशक्तियुक्तत्वाद्युक्तमिति सर्वाधारत्वे सत्यन्यैकाश्रितत्वलिङ्गेनाकाशोऽत्र
 श्रीतत्त्वमितिध्येयम् ॥ फले त्वदृश्यत्वादियुतस्याक्षरस्य विष्ण्वन्यत्वे प्राचीनं
 तादृशाक्षरमपि तथेत्यदृश्यत्वनयाक्षेपसमाधी ॥ ३ ॥

The one referred to as *akshara* is none other than *Vishnu*. For

- After describing *aakaasha* (*sri tatva* referred by that name) as the one that supports everything past present and future, *upanishat* says O! Gargi, it is *akshara* where *aakasha* is blended in and out of it. Thus calling it as the support of *Lakshmi*.

The description “*etasya vaa aksharasya prashaasane gaargi*” explaining *akshara* as the supreme master of everything with no delimiters and independence (the capacity that is not provided by anyone) fits only in *Vishnu*. The description “*asthoolam anaNu*” meaning he is neither big nor small in size is but the natural quality of *Vishnu* who does not have the size made up of matter, but is the one who is having the qualities opposite to what can be described as small or big.

The descriptions like “*eko daadhhaara bhuvanani* – alone he supports the worlds”, “*saptardhagarbha bhuvanasya reto vishnoh tishtanthi pradishaa* – the seven well grown objects that cause the universe engage in various tasks under the orders of *Vishnu*”, “*ashtoolam, anaNu, amadhyamah, madhyamah, vyaapakah, avyaapakah* – He is neither large nor atomic, nor is he of medium size, not even that he is not of medium size, is spread everywhere and not spread as such” suit only *Vishnu*.

As described in *vedas*, *Vishnu* alone is the one who does not have any of the four kinds of losses viz., *anityatvam dehahaanih* etc. The quality described by the literal meaning of *akshara*, viz., “the one who does not have any kind of losses” is in abundance with *Vishnu* and also because the vedic text says “*tasmaat aksharam, tasmaat aksharam* – it is for this reason, he is called *akshara*”, he alone is meant by the word “*akshara*”.

The vedic statement that he does not eat only means that he is not for sustenance, unlike *jeevas*.

Possessing of conflicting qualities like atomic and huge sizes are possible in him on account of his unthinkable capabilities.

The word “*aakaasha*” is taken above to mean *Lakshmi*. That is because *aakaasha* is described as the support of everything and as the one being supported one – a quality that can fit in only to *Lakshmi*.

The benefit of this chapter lies in dispelling the doubt that if *akshara*, the one who has the qualities of being unknowable refers to some one other than *Vishnu*, then even the earlier reference of *akshara* should happen to be different.

॥ ॐ ईक्षतिकर्मव्यपदेशात्सः ॐ ॥ ४ ॥

eeekshati-karma-vyapadeshaat-sah - 4

अत्र सदेवेति सच्छब्दार्थस्यान्यत्वे सदायतना इत्युक्तसर्वाधारत्व-
स्याप्यन्यनिष्ठत्वात् प्रागुक्ताम्बरान्तधृतिरपि तस्यैवेत्याक्षेपात्सङ्गतिः । छान्दोग्ये
षष्ठेऽध्याये “सदेव सोम्येदमग्र” इत्युपक्रम्य (छां. ६-२-१) “तदैक्षत बहुस्यां
प्रजायेय” इत्यादिनाकारणत्वादिनोक्तं सत्पदवाच्यं किं ब्रह्म उत प्रधानं इति

सन्देहः । प्रधानमिति पूर्वः पक्षः । बहु स्यामिति तेजःप्रभृतिबहुभावश्रवणात् तस्य परिणममाने प्रधान एव योगात्, "निर्विकारोऽक्षरः शुद्ध" इत्यादिश्रुतेः ईशे निर्विकारे तदयोगात् । न चात्र स्वरूपबहुभाव एवोक्तः न तेज आद्यात्मना बहुभाव इति वाच्यम् । तत्तेजोऽसृजतेति वाक्यशेषविरोधात् । न हि स्वरूपबहुभावं सङ्कल्प्य तेजःप्रभृतिसर्जनं युक्तम् । ईक्षणं तु प्रधानस्य ज्ञानहेतुसत्त्वगुणयोगेन वा कार्योन्मुखत्वेन वा अभिमानिन इक्षितृत्वेन वा गौणमिति ॥

If the one referred to by the name "sat" as in "*sadeva soumya idam agra aaseet* – It was only sat that existed in the beginning" is different from the one referred to as sat in "*imaah sarvaah prajaah sadaayatanaah* – all these persons are residing in (dependent on) sat", then the quality of being the support of *aakaasha* should also belong to such other person. With this objection, this chapter gets the sequential reference to the previous chapter.

We find a narration in *Chandogya Upanishat* that begins with "*sadeva somya idam agra aaseet* – O! Somya, it was only Sat that existed at the beginning" and says "That Sat desired to have many offsprings" etc. Whether the referred Sat speaks of *Brahma* or *Pradhaanam* (*jada prakriti*) is the question. The *poorvapaksha* says, it is *Pradhaanam*. Since it refers to creation of many things like *Tejas* (Fire / energy), it is only *Pradhaanam* that can transform into several forms. *Eeshwara* is described as "*nirvikaaro aksharah shuddhah* – the one who does not mutate, does not experience any loss and is flawless". Hence a transformation in / of him is not possible. It cannot be said that the statement "*bahu syaam prajaayeya*" speaks of ones own multiple forms and not the creation of *Tejas* etc. Such an interpretation would conflict the later part of the quoted text that reads as "*tat tejo asrijata* – That created *Tejas*". It is not logical to say that after declaring creation ones own forms, the newer objects like *Tejas* are created.

Well the contention that *pradhaana* only has created the universe has an issue. *Pradhaana* being lifeless object, the statement of desire cannot be attributed to this. This can be resolved by construing it as possible on account of an association with *Satva guna*, which is the cause of knowledge or by meaning it to be just a preparation for the action or in the secondary sense, referring to the *abhimaani* deity.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ तदैक्षतेत्युक्तेशितृत्वस्य मुख्यसम्भवे अमुख्यस्य ग्रहणायोगात् । अभिमानिनयन्यायेन तेजःप्रभृतीनां देवतात्वेन तदात्मना बहुभावस्य प्रधानेऽप्ययोगात् नियामकस्वरूपबहुभावस्य नियम्यसृष्टिसापेक्षत्वेन स्वरूपबहुभावसङ्कल्पेऽपि नियम्यतेजःप्रभृतिसर्जनस्य सङ्गतत्वात् एकस्या-पीश्वरस्य गुहानयन्यायेन बहुत्वस्य द्युभ्वादिनयोक्तन्यायेन जननस्य च सम्भवात्, मुख्येशितृत्वेन लिङ्गेन कारणत्वादिना सत्पदवाच्यं ब्रह्मैवेति ॥ फले तु सदेवेत्यवधारणेन प्रधानस्यैव कारणत्वप्रतीत्या ईशे तदभावादित्यादिना चन्द्रिकोक्तदिशा जन्मादिसूत्राक्षेपसमाधी ॥ ४ ॥

It is not proper to have a secondary meaning while the primary one is possible with no conflicts. The names *Tejas* etc speak of not just the inert objects but their *abhimaani* (regulatory) deities as is explained in the *sootra* “*abhimaani-vyapadeshastu..*”. It is also evident that the non-living *pradhaana* cannot transform itself into deities. The creation of regulators has no relevance in the absence of the objects to be regulated like *tejas*. A declaration to create ones own forms by *Vishnu* is relevant in the context of creation of those getting regulated, viz., the deities and the objects *tejas* etc. Though *eeshwara* is single, the existence and creation of multiplicity of forms are logical as explained in the *sootra* “*guhaam pravishtou aatmaanou..*”. In view of the *linga* (identifying attribute) of “desire” that is meant in its primary sense

is with *Brahma* and him being the cause of *tejas* etc, the one referred to by the word “*Sat*” is none other than *Brahma*.

The benefit of this chapter lies in raising an objection that the assertive sentence “*sad eva*” refers to *pradhaana* as the cause of the universe and consequently the said quality does not exist in *Vishnu* thus defeating the conclusion in the *sootra* “*janmaadyasya..*” and its resolution.

॥ ॐ दहर उत्तरेभ्यः ॐ ॥ ५ ॥

dahara uttarebhyah – 5

॥ ॐ गतिशब्दाभ्यां तथा हि दृष्टं लिङ्गं च ॐ ॥ ॐ धृतेश्च

महिम्नोऽस्यास्मिन्नुपलब्धेः ॐ ॥ ॐ प्रसिद्धेश्च ॐ ॥

॥ ॐ इतरपरामर्शात्स इति चेन्न असम्भवात् ॐ ॥

॥ ॐ उत्तराच्चेदाविर्भूतस्वरूपस्तु ॐ ॥ ॐ अन्यार्थश्च परामर्शः ॐ ॥ ॐ
अल्पश्रुतेरिति चेत्तदुक्तम् ॐ ॥

*gati-shabdaabhyaam tathaa hi drishtam lingam cha; dhriteshcha mahimno-
asya-asminn-upalabdheh; prasiddeshcha; itara-paraamarshaat-sa iti
chenna asambhavaat; uttaraacched-aavirbhuuta-svaroopastu;
anyaarthashcha paraamarshah; alpashruteriti chet-taduktam;*

अत्र “उभे अस्मिन्द्यावापृथिवी”त्यादिना हृत्पद्यस्थस्य सर्वाधारत्वश्रवणात् तस्य विष्वन्यत्वे इमाः प्रजाः सदायतना इत्यादिना तथोक्तं तत् सदप्यन्यदिति पूर्वाक्षेपेण पूर्वपक्षोत्थानात्सङ्गतिः । छान्दोग्ये अष्टमाध्यायाद्यखण्डे “यदिदम-स्मिन्ब्रह्मपुरे दहरं पुण्डरीकं वेश्म दहरोऽस्मिन्नन्तर आकाशस्तस्मिन्यदन्तस्त-दन्वेष्टव्यं तद्वाव विजिज्ञासितव्यमिति तं चेद्ब्रूयुर्यदिदमस्मिन्ब्रह्मपुरे दहरं पुण्डरीकं वेश्म दहरोऽस्मिन्नन्तर आकाशः किं तदत्र विद्यते यदन्वेष्टव्यं यद्वाव विजिज्ञासितव्यमिति स ब्रूयात् यावान्वाऽयमाकाशस्तावानेषोऽन्तर्हृदय आकाशः उभे अस्मिन् द्यावापृथिवी अन्तरेव समाहिते” इत्यादिना (छां. ८-१-१)

सर्वाधारत्वेन श्रुतं हृत्पद्मस्थं किमाकाशः जीवो वा विष्णुर्वेति सन्देहः । आकाश एव न तु ब्रह्मेति पूर्वः पक्षः॥ गगने प्रसिद्धस्यैवाकाशशब्दस्य हृत्पद्मस्थे प्रयोगात् । न च तस्य सर्वाधारत्वाख्य ब्रह्मलिङ्गश्रवणात् आकाशस्तल्लिङ्गादितिन्यायेन ब्रह्मवाचित्वमिति वाच्यम् । पद्मकोशप्रतीकाशं हृदयमिति प्रकृत्य तस्यान्ते सुषिरं सूक्ष्मं तस्मिन्सर्वं प्रतिष्ठितमिति श्रुत्यन्तरे(माना. उ) सुषिरशब्दिताकाशस्यैव हृत्पद्मस्थत्वसर्वाधारत्वयोरुक्त्या तत्समाख्याविरोधात् । आकाशस्यैव ब्रह्मत्वे तत्स्थस्यान्वेष्टव्यत्वोक्तेरयोगाच्च । न चाकाशस्य प्रसिद्धाकाशत्वेऽपि तत्स्थतया परम्परया हृत्पद्मस्थं ब्रह्मेति वाच्यम् । वाक्यान्वयायोगात् । किं तदत्र विद्यत इति प्रश्ने ब्रह्म विद्यत इत्येव वाच्ये यावान्वेत्यादिनान्तर्हृदयाकाशस्य बाह्याकाश-तौल्योक्तेरसङ्गतत्वात् सुषिरश्रुतिविरोधापत्त्या यावानिति वाक्ये सर्वाधारतयो-क्ताकाशस्य ब्रह्मत्वाङ्गीकारेणापि तद्वाक्यसङ्गत्युक्त्ययोगाच्च । प्रागुक्तमेव दहराकाशं बाह्याकाशतुल्यतया विशिष्य तत्र द्यावापृथिव्यादिकं विद्यत इति उभे अस्मिन्नित्यादिनोच्यत इत्युक्तेरेव सङ्गतत्वेन द्यावापृथिव्यादेरेवाकाशान्तस्थ-त्वौचित्यात् । अतः साक्षात् हृत्पद्मस्थमाकाशं परम्परया तु द्यावापृथिव्यादि-कमित्येकः । जीवो वा दहराकाशान्तस्थ इत्यन्यः । दहराकाशस्थे य आत्माऽपहतपाप्मेति वाक्यशेषे आत्मशब्दप्रयोगात् तस्यैष आत्मेत्युत्तरवाक्ये प्राक्सम्प्रसादपदेन प्रस्तुतं जीवमेष इति पुल्लिङ्गैतच्छब्देन परामृश्य आत्मत्वविधानेन जीवार्थत्वात् । दहरस्थत्वलिङ्गाच्च तस्य सर्वगते विष्णावयोगात् । व्योम्नोऽशस्यापूर्णत्वेन अंशतोऽल्पौकस्त्वयोगेऽपि ब्रह्मणोऽशस्यापि पूर्णत्वेन व्योमवत्समाधानायोगाच्च यावान्वेत्यादिवाक्यानन्वयस्य ब्रह्मपक्षेऽपि सामान्यादिति (साम्यादिति)॥

There is a vedic narration that the worlds of earth and heaven (*dyu loka*) are in someone who is staying in the lotus of heart. He is described as the one who is the support for everything. If this were to be different from *Vishnu*, then the one referred to earlier with the word “*sat*” as in “*sadaayatanaah* and described as the support for everything should also be other than *Vishnu*. This chapter has the sequential reference with the previous one through such an objection.

We find a conversation in the first *khanda* of the eighth *adhyaya* of *Chandogya Upanishat* as under:

- Guru - “In this land of *Brahma*, there is a small house in the form of a lotus. In that lotus is a small place. Whoever is there, within that, needs to be discovered and he be the subject of meditation”.

Disciple - “Who is this that stays within the small space of the lotus of the land of *Brahma*, which needs to be discovered and meditated upon?”

Guru - “Whatever is this *aakaasha* (sky), the same space lies within the heart. Both these worlds of earth and heaven are positioned within this space”.

Whether the referred thing in which the worlds of earth and heaven are positioned is *aakaasha* (space) or *jeeva* or *Vishnu* is the question.

The *poorvapaksha* says it has to be *aakaasha* and not *Brahma*. For

- The same word *aakaasha* that is popular in addressing sky is used here to denote the one staying within the heart.

Though the attribute of being the support of everything indicates him to be *Vishnu* as concluded in the *sootra* “*aakashas-tallingat*”, it cannot be taken so. For, in a similar narration in *mahanarayana upanishat*, it begins with “*padma-kosha-prateekaasham hridayam* – the heart is like a lotus” and says that at its tip is a tiny hole and in that everything is positioned. Thus, it is the space that is mentioned here with the word “hole” and it is stated to be located within the heart and as the support for everything.

If *aakasha* (space) itself is *Brahma*, then the mandate that the one staying inside of *aakasha* should be meditated upon would not fit in.

If it were to be said that the word *aakashā* refers to the popular sky and that when it comes to saying someone within that *aakashā*, such a thing is possible by considering the fact that the body stays in *aakashā* inside of which is the heart, within which stays *Brahma*. However, such an interpretation does not fit in looking at the formation of the sentence. Had that been true, the response to the question as to what exists there, the reply should have been straight with the word “*Brahma*”. Instead, there is a detailed narration equating it with the external space, which would have been irrelevant.

Fearing contradiction to the expression in “*tasyaante sushiram sookshmam..* – there is a hole at the end..”, if the one who is the support for everything as described in the text “*yaavaan..*” is treated as *Brahma*, it would still not fetch the relevance of the statement with reference to the question. What is relevant here is a description of the thing of previous reference, viz., the space within the small area of the heart, as the one that is on par with the external space and that the worlds of *dyu* and *prithivi* are positioned in that through the words “*ubhe asmin ..*”. Thus, it is proper to say that the worlds of *dyu* and *prithivi* are located inside the space.

Hence, it is *aakaasha* that is directly staying within the lotus of heart and the worlds of *prithivi* and *dyu* stay in it indirectly.

Another opinion is that it is *jeeva* who is staying in the minute space of heart. For

- The subsequent mantra (8-1-5) of the said *upanishat* speaks of him to be *aatma* and *apahatapaapmaa*.

The same *aatma* is referred to in the third *adhyaya* as the one who had “*samprasaada* – the extraordinary grace” and

is referred to with the word “*esha*”, the pronoun in masculine gender, thus indicating it to be *jeeva*.

While the attribute of staying in a tiny place suits *jeeva*, it does not fit in *Vishnu*, who is spread everywhere.

Though the *amsha* (part) of *aakaasha* can be in a tiny place while the whole of it is spread everywhere, the same rule cannot be applied to *Brahma*, for the *amsha* of *aakaasha* is incomplete whereas that of *Brahma* is as complete as that of the main. Hence an *amsha* of *Brahma* cannot be considered to exist in a tiny place.

As regards the narration of “*yaavaan vaa..*” equating with the external space, it does not fit in for *jeeva* and it is so for *Brahma* as well.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ हृदयस्थदहराकाशान्तःस्थतया हृत्पद्मस्थं ब्रह्मैव । य आत्मा
अपहतपाप्मेत्युत्तरवाक्ये श्रुतापहतपाप्मत्वविजरत्वविमृत्युत्वविशोकत्वादि-
लिङ्गेभ्यः । तेषां च “स एष सर्वेभ्यः पाप्मभ्यः उदितः” (छां. १-६-७)
“योऽशनायापिपासे शोकं मोहं जरां मृत्युमत्येति” (बृ. ५-५-१) इत्यादिना
विष्णवेकनिष्ठत्वात् । तथा “अहरहर्गच्छन्त्यः एतं ब्रह्मलोकं न विन्दन्ती”ति (छां.
८-३-२) सुप्तप्राप्यत्वलिङ्गात् तस्य च “सता सौम्य तदा सम्पन्नो भवती”ति
(छां. ६-८-१) वाक्ये ईक्षतिनयन्यायेन (निर्णीते) ब्रह्मधर्मतया श्रवणात् ।

The one who is inside the tiny space of the lotus of heart is none other than *Brahma*. For in the subsequent sentence of the referred text, he is described as the one who is free from sins, never aging, never dying and never affected by sorrow. These attributes are related to *Vishnu* alone as can be seen in the statements of various *upanishats* like “He is above all sins”, “He is the one who is beyond hunger, thirst, sorrow, illusion, aging and death”. There is also a statement that though *jeeva* enters *brahma loka* everyday while asleep, he does not know the same. In its previous sentence, we find the description that “then O! Soumya, *Jeeva* reaches *Sat*”.

The word “sat” refers to *Vishnu* as has been described in the *sootra* “*ekshater naashabdam*”.

ब्रह्मणो लोकमिति हृत्पद्मस्थे ब्रह्मलोकपदप्रयोगेण ब्रह्मैव वा सर्वाश्रयत्वादिना लोकपदोक्तमिति हृत्पद्मस्थे ब्रह्मपदश्रवणात् । तथा “अरश्च ह वै ण्यश्चार्णवौ ब्रह्मलोके” (छां. ८-५-३) इत्यरण्याख्यसुधासमुद्राश्रयलोके प्रयुक्तस्य ब्रह्मलोकपदस्य हृत्पद्मे प्रयोगेण तत्स्थस्य सुधासमुद्राश्रयलोकवत्त्वलिङ्गश्रवणात् । तस्य च “अरश्च ह वै ण्यश्च सुधासमुद्रौ” इत्यादिभाष्योक्तश्रुत्या विष्णुधर्मत्वात् । तथा “अयमात्मा स सेतुर्विधृतिः एषां लोकानां असंभेदाये”ति(छां. ८-४-१) हृत्पद्मस्थे श्रुतसर्वाधारत्वलिङ्गात् । तस्य च अक्षरादिनये विष्णुधर्मत्वेन निर्णयात् ।

By describing the space in the heart as *brahma loka*, it is indicated that the one staying in it is *Brahma*. Another meaning is that *Brahma* is himself *loka*, the one who is the mentor of everything. The same *upanishat* describes *brahma loka* as the one having two seas of nectar named “*ara*” and “*Nya*”. By using the same name here for the space in heart, it indicates the commonness of its resident. This provides an identifier for the one who is in the lotus of heart as the one who is stationed in the world having two seas of nectar. As per the evidence provided by Sri Acharya in *Bhaashya* that reads as “*arascha vai Nyascha..*” such an attribute belongs exclusively to *Vishnu*. This apart, the one staying in the lotus of heart is described as “*ayam aatmaa sa seturvidhritih..*”, the one who is supporting everything. This again is the characteristic feature of *Vishnu* as has been decided in the *sootra* “*akshram ambaraantadhrith..*”(1.3.10) etc.

तथा “य एषोऽन्तर्हृदय आकाशः तस्मिन् शेते सर्वस्य वशी” इत्यादि (बृ. ६-४-२२) काण्वश्रुतिसमाख्यानात् । तस्याश्च सर्वेश्वरत्वादिविष्णुमहिमोक्त्या वैष्णवत्वात् । तथा “दहरं विपापं परवेशमभूतं हृत्पुण्डरीकं पुरमध्यसंस्थम्,

तत्रापि दहं गगनं विशोकः तस्मिन् यदन्तः तदुपासितव्यमिति (महाना. उ.)
विष्णुपरतया प्रसिद्धतैत्तिरीयसमाख्यानाच्च ।

We also find a matching expression in *Brihadaaranyaka upanishat* where it says "It is this space lying inside the heart, where the one who is master of everything relaxes". This description belongs to *Vishnu* since it appears in the part that describes the glory of *Vishnu*. Similarly, we find a matching description in that part of *taittiriya* branch which is very well known as belonging to *Vishnu* – *Maha-naarayana-panishat*. The description there is "There is a small lotus in the heart which is devoid of sins and is the abode of God. This is inside the body. Inside this lotus, is a small sky that is devoid of pain. The one who is staying inside this space needs to be meditated upon".

साधकाभावाज्जीवादौ अपहृतपाप्मत्वादीनां "अशनायादिकानन्ये तत्प्रसादात्
तरन्ति हि" (पाद्म.पु.) इत्यादेः स्वातन्त्र्येणासम्भवात् । "स तत्र पर्येती"त्यादि-
वाक्ये (छां. ८-१२-३) च मुक्तस्यैव सत्यकामत्वाद्युक्तेः । तस्य च
हृत्पद्मस्थत्वायोगात् । "एष आत्मा" इति वाक्ये (छां ८-३-४) विधेयापेक्षया
पुल्लिङ्गेनैतच्छब्देन परंज्योतिरिति प्रस्तुतस्य "ॐ आत्मा प्रकरणात् ॐ (ब्र. सू.
४-४-३) इत्यत्र ब्रह्मतया निर्णेष्यमाणस्य ज्योतीरूपब्रह्मण एव परामर्शेन
हृत्पद्मस्थात्मत्वविधानात् । अल्पौकस्त्वस्य सर्वत्रेति नये (ब्र.सू. १-२-१)
विष्णावपि साधितत्वात् । अचिन्त्यशक्त्यादिना पूर्णस्याप्यल्पौकस्त्वोपपत्तेः ।
शरीरपुण्डरीकयोः ब्रह्म प्रति पुरत्ववेश्मत्वोक्त्यैव आकाशस्थस्य अन्वेष्टव्यस्य
ब्रह्मत्वसिद्धौ कीदृशं तदिति भावेन "किं तदत्रे"ति प्रश्ने तस्य ब्रह्मणो हृदये
यावानयं बाह्याकाशः तावान् सर्वोऽप्यस्ति तस्मिन् द्यावापृथिव्यादिकमस्ति
इत्याकाशदिसर्वाश्रयत्वादिकमुच्यत इति यावानित्यादिवाक्यान्वयोपपत्तेः ।
परपक्ष एव आकाशस्थं किमिति पृष्टे आकाशस्य बाह्याकाशतौल्योक्तयनुपपत्तिः ।
मन्दिरे मणिमालेतिवत् सुषिरस्थेशस्य स्वाधारत्वाशयेन सुषिरश्रुत्युपपत्तेश्च

बाधकाभावाच्चेति ॥ फलं तु चन्द्राद्याधारत्वमुखेन अक्षराधिकरणाक्षेपः
तत्समाधिश्चेति ॥ ५ ॥

The one in the lotus of heart cannot be considered to be *jeeva* for,

- There are no evidences in support of it.
- He has been described as the one devoid of sins. Such a situation happens to *jeeva* only on getting *moksha*, which is obtained by the grace of God and not independently as explained in *Padma puraana* (*asanaayaadikaan anye tatprasaadaat taranti hi*).

He has been described as *satyakaama* (he whose desires are met invariably). *Jeevas* do possess this quality albeit only in *moksha*. They would not have this body and heart at that time. Hence the description of staying in the lotus of heart in the midst of body does not fit in to them.

The word “*esha*” in the statement “*esha aatma*” is in masculine gender and is referring to the one named “*paranjyothi*” in the same sentence (“*paranjyotir-upasampadya swena roopena abhinishpadyate, esya aatma*”). In the upcoming *sootra* “*aatma prakaranaat*” (4.4.3) it is being confirmed that *paranjyoti* is *Brahma*. It is only this *brahma* in the form of *jyothi* that is referred to here as the one dwelling inside the heart.

As regards the objection that the omnipresent *Vishnu* cannot be considered as dwelling in a small space, the same has been resolved in the earlier *sootra* “*sarvatra prasiddhopadeshat*” (1-2-1). In view of the unthinkable prowess of *Vishnu*, he can very well be considered as staying in a tiny place while he is *poorna* (complete in absolute terms).

Though it gets confirmed that the one staying in the tiny space and the one to be discovered is *Brahma* while the body and the lotus of heart are explained as related to *Brahma*, the conversation continues to know who he is (what are his attributes). Hence in

response to “what exists there”, the reply is, whatever is the extent to which it exists in the outer space, the entire of it stays in the tiny space of heart. It is in this that the worlds of *dyu* and *prithivi* etc are existing. Thus the words can be aligned to make them mean “the one staying in the tiny space of heart is described as the one supporting the entire space and the universe staying in it”. In fact there is non-coherence in the interpretation made by others who say “in response to the question who is there in the space, the reply is, it is on par with the external space”.

The *poorvapaksha* had referred to *mahanaarayan upanishat* and said that the tiny space, *aakaasha* lying within the heart holds everything and it cannot be *Brahma*. For, *Brahma* is said to be staying in it. This objection can be resolved with an understanding that everything lies in *Brahma*, who is stationed in the *aakasha* that is within the lotus of heart inside the body. This is like saying “the jewel is in the temple” while it is kept in the box within the steel safe inside the safe room of the temple.

॥ ॐ अनुकृतेस्तस्य च ॐ ॥ ६ ॥

anukrites-tasya cha - 6

॥ ॐ अपि स्मर्यते ॐ ॥

api smaryate;

पूर्वत्र एष आत्मेत्येतच्छब्दस्य ज्योतिःशब्दितब्रह्मपरामर्शित्वेऽपि विधेयात्मापेक्षया पुंस्त्वं युक्तम् । इह तु तदेतदिति शब्दयोर्द्वयोः प्राक्तनेशपरत्वे क्लीबत्वमयुक्तमिति पूर्ववैषम्येण शङ्कनात्सङ्गतिः । काठके “तदेतदिति मन्यन्तेऽनिर्देश्यं परमं सुखम् । कथं नु तद्विजानीयां किमु भाति न भाति वा” इति (का. २-२-१२, १४) श्रुतं ज्ञानार्थं प्रार्थित्वरूपं आनुकूल्येन गृह्यमाणत्वं किं ज्ञानिसुखस्य उत विष्णोरिति सन्देहः ॥ पूर्वपक्षस्तु ॥ “तद्विजानीया”मिति तच्छब्दस्य

पूर्वार्धोक्तसुखपरामर्शात् तस्य च "तमात्मस्थं येऽनुपश्यन्ति धीरास्तेषां सुखं शाश्वतं नेतरेषां" इति पूर्वत्र प्रकृतसन्निहितज्ञानिसुखपरामर्शितदेतच्छब्दबलेन प्रत्यभिज्ञाज्ञापकसुखपदेन च ज्ञानिसुखत्वात् "एको वशी"त्यादिना (का. २-२-१२) ईशस्य प्रकृतत्वेऽपि व्यवधानात् द्वयोर्नपुंसकत्वायोगाच्च ज्ञानिसुखस्यैवेति ॥

The previous chapter discussed *Brahma* referred to by the name *jyothi*. Though the word "*Brahma*" is in neutral gender, he has been described as "*aatma*" and this word is in masculine gender and accordingly the *sootra* has taken the word "*dahara*" in masculine gender. In this chapter the subject statement "*tadetat*" etc has both the words "*tat*" and "*etat*" are in neutral gender. If these two words refer to God, who has been denoted in masculine gender, then the words should not have been in neutral gender. This chapter begins with such an objection and hence has the sequence of objection with the previous one.

Kaathaka Upanishat has a statement (*katham nu tad vijaaneeyaam..*) expressing the anxiety to know that which is "complete pleasure" and says whether it is possible to know it or not possible as such. Whether this earnest request to know pertains to the pleasure of *jnaani* or *Vishnu* is the question.

Poorvapaksha – The word "*tat* -That" in the aforesaid statement refers to the "pleasure" that has been narrated in the previous half of the verse which states "*tam aatmasthanam ye anu pashyanti dheeraah teshaam sukham shaashvatam netareshaam* – The pleasure of those learned persons who see the one that stays in *aatma* is eternal and not that of others". The expression "*tadetat* – the same is" refers to a thing referenced in the immediate past and is recalled. That is "*jnaani sukham* – the pleasure of learned people". Though there is a reference to *Vishnu* through the words

“eko vashi..”, the same is not present in the immediate proximity to the words “*tadetat*” and that the words are in masculine gender, while the words “*tat etat*” are in neutral gender. Hence cannot be considered to refer to *Vishnu*. Thus it is only *jnaani sukham* that is sought to be known and not *Vishnu*.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ “न तत्र सूर्यो भाती”ति “तमेव भान्तमनुभाति सर्वमि”ति “तस्य भासा सर्वमिदं विभाती”ति च (का. २-२-१५) श्रुतानां सूर्याद्यप्रकाश्यत्व सूर्यादिप्रकाशनहेतुत्व सर्वजगत्प्रकाशकत्वानां लिङ्गानां “न तद्भासयते सूर्यः” (भ.गी. १५-६) “अहं तत्तेजो रश्मीत्” (चतुर्वेदशिखा) “यदादित्यगतं तेजः” (भ.गी. १५-१२) इत्यादिवचनैः ईशैकनिष्ठत्वात् । तेनेत्यादेः सन्निहित “तद्विजानीया”मित्येतत्परामर्शित्वस्वारस्यात् “तदेतद्” इत्यत्र ईशपरामर्शित्वेऽपि “यदनिर्देश्यं परमं सुखं कथन्तु तद्विजानीयां” इत्यानुकूल्येन गृह्णन्ति, विज्ञानार्थं प्रार्थयन्त इति यावत्, तदनिर्देश्यं सुखं एतत् प्रस्तुतात्मरूपं इति योजनायां तदेतच्छब्दयोरपि क्लीबतोपपत्तेः । चेतनश्चेतनानामिति ईशस्यापि सन्निधानेन प्रकृतत्वादीशस्यैवेति ॥ फलं तु अनिर्देश्यमित्यादिनोक्तादृश्यत्वमुखेन अदृश्यत्वनयाक्षेपस्तत्समाधिश्च ॥ ६ ॥

The very next sentence succeeding the one containing the expression “*katham nu tad vijaaneeyaam*” describes the one sought to be known as:

- The one which cannot be lit up with Sun
- The one whose light forms the source of luminescent objects to emit light
- The one whose light alone makes everything to glow

These qualities of not being lit by Sun, source of Sun’s light and the light that enables visibility of the entire universe are exclusive to *Vishnu*. Similar are the other expressions like “*na tad bhaasayate suryah*” in *Bhagavad Geeta*, “*aham tat tejo rashmeet*” in *Chaturveda shikha*, “*yadaaditya gatam tejah*” in *Bhagavad Geeta* communicating the same meaning.

As regards the proximity, the expression “*na tatra suryo bhaati*” has the word “*tatra*” that refers to the one in the previous sentence that says “*katham nu tad vijaaneeyaam*” and hence has the relevance of proximity.

As regards the gender mismatch, that can be resolved by looking at the context. It is certain from the above that it is *Vishnu* who is referred to as the one sought to be known. Hence it should be understood as “That which is referred to as *anirdeshyam sukham*” is none other than *Vishnu*, who is described as *eko vashi*. This apart, it is only *Vishnu* that has been referred to in the previous sentence as “*chetanh chetanaanaam*” and that is in masculine gender.

The benefit of this chapter lies in raising an objection on considering the one referred to as *adrishya* earlier as *Vishnu* on account of the same being referred to as *anirdeshyam paramam sukham* and its resolution.

॥ ॐ शब्दादेव प्रमितः ॐ ॥ ७ ॥

shabdaad-eva pramitah - 7

॥ ॐ हृद्यपेक्षया तु मनुष्याधिकारत्वात् ॐ ॥

hridyapekshayaa tu manushyaadhikaaratvaat;

अत्र “विश्वे देवा उपासते” इत्यन्यस्य (का. २-२-३) उपास्यत्वोक्त्या तज्ज्ञानादेव मोक्षावश्यम्भावात् “तमात्मस्थं येऽनुपश्यन्ति” इत्युक्तस्य (का. २-२-१२) विष्णुज्ञानादेव मोक्ष इत्यस्य आक्षेपात्सङ्गतिः । काठके “अङ्गुष्ठमात्रः पुरुषो आत्मनि तिष्ठति ईशानो भूतभव्यस्य” (का. २-१-१२) इत्युक्तेशानः किं मुख्यवायुः उत विष्णुरिति सन्देहः । वायुरिति पूर्वः पक्षः । “ऊर्ध्वं प्राणमुन्नयति अपानं प्रत्यगस्यति मध्ये वामनमासीनं विश्वेदेवा उपासते”

इति प्रणादिव्यवस्थापकत्वमध्यमत्वसर्वदेवोपास्यत्वानां श्रवणात् तेषां च "एवमेव एष प्राण इतरान् प्राणान् पृथक्पृथगेव सन्निधत्ते" इति (षट्प्र. ३-४) "अथेममेव नाप्नोद्योऽयं मध्यमः प्राणः" इति (बृ. ३-६-२१) वाजसनेये तृतीये, वाजसनेये चतुर्थे "शिशुः योऽयं मध्यमः प्राणः" (बृ. ४-२-१) इति शिशुब्राह्मणे । "कुविदङ्ग नमसा" (क.७-९ १-१) इत्यादिश्रुतिभिः वायु-धर्मत्वावगमात् । विष्णावक्षरनये अणुत्वोक्तावपि इह श्रुताङ्गष्टमात्रत्वायोगाच्च । तस्य ततोऽधिकपरिमाणराहित्यार्थत्वात् । न च हृदयापेक्षयोपपत्तिः । विकल्पासहत्वात् । यत्किञ्चिदङ्गुष्ठमितत्वे निर्धारणयोगेन उपासनानुपपत्त्या तदुक्तिवैयर्थ्यात् । तत्तदङ्गुष्ठमितत्वे पश्चादेस्तदभावेन तदन्तस्थस्य तत्त्वायोगादिति ॥

In the previous chapter the statement of *Kaathaka Upanishat* has been referred to, discussed and concluded that on seeing the one staying in *Aatma*, i.e., *Vishnu* one would achieve *moksha*. However the same *upanishat* at another place refers to some one else and says "*vishwe deva upaasate* – all the deities meditate upon him". Thus indicating that the knowledge of such other person leads to *moksha*. This chapter begins with the objection on the conclusion that knowledge of *Vishnu* leads to *moksha* and hence has the sequence of objection with its previous one.

Kaathaka Upanishat says "there is one person in the midst of the body and he is of the size of the thumb. He is the ruler of everything past and future". Whether this ruler is *Mukhya vaayu* or *Vishnu* is the question. *Poorvapaksha* says it is *Vaayu*. The complete sentence of reference is "*oordhvam praanam unnayati apaanam pratyagasyati, madhye vaamanam aaseenam vishwe devaa upaasate*" referring to someone who assigns duties to the *praana*, *apaana*, *vyaana* etc, who stays in the middle of body, and as the one who is worshiped by all the deities. In a similar narration *Shatprashna Upanishat* says "The way the emperor

assigns regions for administration to kings, this *Praana* (*Mukhya vaayu*) assigns the areas of administration to other *praanas*". *Brihadaraanyaka Upanishat* says in its third *adhyaya* "It is this *madhyama praana*, whom the death will not touch" and in its *shishu braahmana* of fourth *adhyaya* it says "It is this *madhyama praana* who is in the shape of a calf". There is a narration as well in *Rig Veda* where it says "The deities who had achieved wisdom through meditating *Vaayu*, met in a secret place and meditated him for the benefit of those suffering in the world". All these indicate that the one who is meditated upon by the deities is *Vaayu*. Another fact to be considered is that in the *sootra* "*aksharam ambaraantah..*", *Vishnu* has been described as of a tiny (atomic) size. The size here, in the text of present discussion, is clearly specified as that of the thumb. The tiny size cannot be considered as anything higher than that. It cannot be said that the thumb-size is only with reference to the heart where he dwells, for the same object cannot have contradictory attributes. Moreover, it is not certain that whose thumb is referred to here to describe the size. There cannot be a meditation with an uncertainty on the object to be meditated upon. If it is to be said that the word "thumb" refers to one's own thumb, then it would not describe the actual size of *Vishnu* in those animals who do not have a thumb.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ वामनमिति श्रुतवामनश्रुते: "एष उ एव वामनिः एष हि सर्वाणि वामानि नयति" (छां. ४-१५-३) "उपेन्द्रो वामनः प्रांशुः" (विष्णु.स.ना.) इत्यादिश्रुतिस्मृतिभिः एकदेशविकृतं अनन्यवद्भवतीति न्यायेन विद्वत्प्रसिद्ध्या च योगरूढिभ्यां विष्णवेकनिष्ठत्वेन अन्यत्रानवकाशात् । प्राणनियामकत्वस्य अन्तर्यामिनयन्यायेन (ब्र.सू. १-२-१८) सर्वनियामके हरौ युक्तत्वात् । "यद्वेवान् प्राणयो नव" (तै.आ.३-१४) इति विशिष्य च श्रुत्यन्तरे वैष्णवत्वोक्तेः मध्य इति मध्यशब्दस्य ऊर्ध्वशब्दसाहचर्येण मध्यदेशवाचितया मध्यमोक्त्यभावेन मध्यदेशोऽवस्थानस्य विष्णावपि योगात् । सर्वदेवोपास्यत्व-स्यापि सर्वजिज्ञास्यत्वपर्यायतया तस्य दहरनये सिद्धत्वात् एवं सावकाशतया

स्वतश्च दुर्बलानां स्वतो निरवकाशतया बलवत्या श्रुत्या बाधात् अङ्गुष्ठमात्रत्वस्य
 च तत्तदङ्गुष्ठमितरूपविशेषस्य व्यक्त्यात्मना अङ्गुष्ठमात्रत्वाद्वा
 तादृशस्थानहृदयगतस्य तत्रस्थानि ईशे उपचाराद्वा युक्तत्वात्
 प्राण्यन्तरस्याङ्गुष्ठाभावेऽपि शास्त्रस्य मनुष्याधिकारित्वेन अदोषात् अयमीशानो
 विष्णुरेवेति । फलं तु उपास्यत्वमुखेन जिज्ञासासूत्राक्षेपः तत्समाधिश्च ॥ ७ ॥

In the above referred sentence of *Upanishat (madhye vaamanam aaseenam)*, we find a name “*Vaamana*”. This name refers to *Vishnu* as can be seen in “*esha u eva vaamanih..*” of *Chandogya Upanishat*, “*upendro vaamanah praamshuh*” in *Vishnu Sahasra Naama* etc. Though the name is *Vaamani* and not *Vaamana* in the quoted text, it does not alter the position by virtue of the rule that a little variance will not alter the position of a word. Just because the tail of a dog is cut, it does not cease to be a dog. The name *Vaamana* fits in *Vishnu* both by its etymological meaning and by the usage of the learned and it is not flexible to address anyone else.

As regards the attribute of being the master of *praanaas*, that fits in *Hari* who is the regulator of everyone as per the maxim in the *sootra* “*antaryaamyadhi..*” (1-2-18). This apart, *Rig veda* specifically says “You provide complete pleasure to *prajaapati* and you regulate the nine *praanas*” confirming that the one regulating *praanaas* is *Vishnu*. The word “*madhya*” could mean either a locational reference or the grade. Since this word is spelt along with *oordhva* (above) in the quoted text of *upanishat* “*madhye vaamanam..*”, it should be taken to mean the location inside the body and hence it fits in for *Vishnu* as well.

The description of being the one worshiped by all deities would mean the subject of meditation by all and this attribute is shown to be of *Vishnu* in the earlier *sootra* “*dahara uttarebhyah..*”. Thus the

shruti (name) which is powerful on its own and being *niravakaasha* (specific) is all the more powerful, it negates the indicators (*linga*) that are inherently weaker than *shruti* and are also weak on account of being *saavakaasha* (accommodative).

As regards the size, the reference to thumb is to explain the extent of manifestation to the size of ones own thumb. This also has a reference to the size of space in heart where *Vishnu* manifests occupying the entire of it.

Since the explanation is meant for the humans, absence of thumb in animals has nothing to do in negating the size. Thus, the master of all is *Vishnu* alone.

The benefit of this chapter lies in causing an objection to the contents of *jijnaasa* sootra by considering *Mukhya praana* as the one meditated upon by all the deities and its resolution.

॥ ॐ तदुपर्यपि बादरायणः सम्भवात् ॐ ॥ ८ ॥

taduparyapi baadaraayanah sambhavaat – 8

॥ ॐ विरोधः कर्मणीति चेन्नानेकप्रतिपत्तेर्दर्शनात् ॐ ॥

॥ ॐ शब्द इति चेन्नातः प्रभवात्प्रत्यक्षानुमानाभ्याम् ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ अत एव च नित्यत्वम् ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ समानानामरूपत्वाच्चावृत्तावप्यविरोधो दर्शनात्स्मृतेश्च ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ मध्वादिष्वसंभवादनधिकारं जैमिनिः ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ ज्योतिषि भावाच्च ॐ ॥

॥ ॐ भावं तु बादरायणोऽस्ति हि ॐ ॥

*virodhah karmaneeeti chenna-aneka-pratipatter-darshanaat;
shabda iti chenna-atah pravhavaat-pratyaksha-anumaanaa-bhyaam; ata
eva cha nityatvam; samaana-naama-roopatvaacchaa-vrittav-apyavirodho
darshanaat-smriteshcha; madhwaadish-vasambhavaad-anadhikaaram
jaiminih; jyotishi bhaavaaccha; bhaavam tu baadaraayano-asti hi;*

पूर्वत्र मनुष्याधिकारत्वादित्युक्तिः तिर्यगाद्यपेक्षयैव, देवादीनां तु अधिकारोऽस्त्येव इत्यत्रोच्यत इति सङ्गतिः । “विश्वे देवा उपासत” इत्युपासकत्वेन श्रुतदेवानां उपासनादौ अधिकारोऽस्ति न वेति सन्देहः । नास्तीति पूर्वः पक्षः ॥ तत्तत्पदविशिष्टानां देवानां उत्पत्तिविनाशवत्त्वे इन्द्रादिपदप्राप्तेः पूर्वं पश्चाच्च इन्द्रादिदेवानामभावेन तदुद्देशेन द्रव्यत्यागात्मकयागादिरूपकर्मविरोधस्य तत्तदेवताबोधकानादिनित्यवेदाप्रामाण्यस्य च आपातात् । पूर्वं पश्चाच्च इन्द्रान्तरस्वीकारेण तेषां प्रवाहतोऽनादिनित्यत्वाङ्गीकारेऽपि एकनामरूपवत्त्वे मानाभावेन नानानामरूपवत्त्वात् एकरूपार्थबोधकवेदाप्रामाण्यानिवारणाच्च, अनादिनित्यत्वेऽवश्यं स्वीकार्ये तादृशानां तत्फले मोक्षेऽर्थिताभावात् । किंच वसुत्वादिफलकमधुविद्यादिषु वस्वादीनामधिकारायोगेन सर्वविद्यासु अनधिकारात्, मोक्षफलिकास्वपि “नैव देवपदं प्राप्ताः ब्रह्मदर्शनवर्जिताः” इत्यादेः तेषां सिद्धज्ञानतया मोक्षहेतुज्ञानार्थं अधिकारायोगादिति ॥

The eligibility for vedic studies mentioned in the previous chapter with the words “*manushyaadhikaaratvaat* - eligibility to only *manushya* (humans)” is only to negate it to the lower animals, birds and plants etc. This chapter describes the availability of such an eligibility to the deities and others who are above humans. Hence has the context with the previous one.

The vedic statement “*vishwe deva upaasate*” speaks of all the deities meditating on *Vishnu*. Are they eligible for such meditation or not is the question.

Poorvapaksha says, they do not have the eligibility. Let us see how – The names *Indra*, *Varuna*, *Agni* etc are not the names of individuals but refer to the positions like we have the names like President, Prime Minister, Minister, Secretary etc. The individuals manning the posts will be addressed by the name of the posts they hold. The individuals now holding the positions of *Indra*, *Varuna* etc are so not eternally but from some date. Hence they have a

beginning. Similarly, their tenure has an end and they would cease to hold the positions after that date. They would either go to *moksha* or get promoted to the next post as in the case of *Rudra* getting promoted as *Sesha*, *Vaayu* getting promoted as *Chaturmukha*. (These promotions are within the same cadre and grade and do not mean an elevation).

The question now is whether the deities hold the posts eternally or have achieved them through *upaasana* and hold them till their tenure ends. If they have achieved the positions through *upaasana*, it means that during the period when these deities were humans and doing *upaasana*, the posts were vacant. In other words there was no *Indra* or *Varuna* etc at that time. If that be true, the offerings made in *yajna* in their names have had no recipient and the vedic texts that were speaking of them during those periods were speaking untruth. That is not true.

Even if it is accepted that some one else was holding the said posts of *Indra*, *Varuna* etc at that time and that the posts are eternal like the water flowing in rivers where the flow is eternal while the water flowing keeps changing, there is no evidence to say that the individuals have the same name and form. While the names and forms are different, if *Veda* refers to them in some name or form, it would amount to speaking the untruth. Hence it is essential to consider them as eternal. It would then mean that they would not get *moksha* and hence would not have a desire, the essential component of eligibility, to study *Vedas* that would lead to *moksha*.

There are some texts in *Veda* like “*madhu vidya*” etc. On studying and practicing them, one would get the position of *Vasu* deity etc. The deities *Vasu* etc would not have an eligibility to study these texts since they have already achieved the benefits of such *Vidya*.

With this as an example, it can be concluded that the deities do not have eligibility for all *Vidyas*.

It can lead to another assumption that the deities do not have eligibility even for those *vidyas* that lead to *moksha*. The text “*naiva devapadam praaptaah brahmadarshana varjitaah* – Those who have not had *aparoksha* would not get the posts of deities”. Thus, with all the deities having *aparoksha* that assures them of *moksha*, they have no reason to be desirous and consequentially be eligible for those *vidyas* that lead to *moksha*.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ देवानामपि विशिष्टबुद्ध्यादिमत्वात् शूद्रवत् अपर्युदस्तत्वात् आद्यन्तवत्त्वेन मोक्षेऽर्थित्वस्यापि सम्भवात् तेषां उत्पत्तिविनाशवत्त्वेऽपि “ते ह नाकं महिमानः सचंत यत्र पूर्वे साध्यास्सन्ति देवाः” “धाता यथा पूर्वमकल्पयत्” (पुरुष सू.) “यथैव नियमः काले सुरादिनियमस्तथा” इत्यादिवचनैः प्रमाणभूतवेदस्य अनादिनित्यत्वान्यथानुपपत्त्या च प्रवाहतोऽनादिनित्यत्वात् तेषां च यथापूर्वमिति श्रुत्या अनादिनिधनेत्यादि स्मृत्या समाननामरूपत्वेन वेदाप्रामाण्यानापत्तेः । मधुविद्यादेः वसुत्वादिफलकत्वेऽपि वस्वादीनां ज्ञाने मोक्षे च अतिशयार्थं तत्र अर्थित्वसम्भवात् अस्ति ब्रह्मविद्यायां अधिकार इति ॥ फलं तु विश्वेदेवा उपासत इत्यादेः पूर्वोक्तस्याप्रामाण्याक्षेप तत्समाधिश्च ॥ ८ ॥

The deities do have eligibility for the vedic studies. For

- They possess the special intelligence
- Their vedic studies are not prohibited as in the case of *shoodras*

They have a beginning and end and hence have a desire to achieve *moksha*.

The texts “they reach that heaven where the previous deities *chaturmukha brahma* and others falling in the category of *ruju*, *Garuda*, *Sesha* and their consorts who have achieved *moksha* are staying”, “God has created

everything exactly the way it was earlier” and “The way it is a rule for the *kaala* (time) that what existed prior to *pralaya* gets created in the next creation, even the deities have it as such” stand in support of the fact of creation and end of deities and that they are eternal only in the sense like the flow of water in a river. These texts also speak of the deities having the same name and form. Hence the objection of a possible untruth getting described by *Vedas* stands resolved.

Though *Madhu vidya* etc are intended to fetch the posts of *Vasu* etc, those who are already in such posts would get benefited by such *vidyas* in the form of an enhanced knowledge and accelerated pleasure in *moksha* and hence the deities of *Vasu* etc have a desire to study and practice the said *vidyas*. Thus, they are eligible.

The benefit of this chapter lies in doubting the authenticity of vedic texts and a resolution of the same.

॥ ॐ शुगस्य तदनादरश्रवणात्तदाद्रवणात्सूच्यते हि ॐ ॥ ९ ॥

shugasya tadanaadara-shravanaat-tadaadravanaat-soochyate hi –

9

॥ ॐ क्षत्रियत्वावगतेश्चोत्तरत्र चैत्ररथेन लिङ्गात् ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ
संस्कारपरामर्शात्तदभावाभिलापाच्च ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ तदभावनिर्धारणे च प्रवृत्तेः ॐ
॥ ॥ ॐ श्रवणाध्ययनार्थप्रतिषेधात्स्मृतेश्च ॐ ॥

*kshatriyatva-avagatesh-chottaratra chaitra-rathena lingaat;
samskaara-paramarshaat-tadabha-abhilaapaac-cha; tadabhaava-
nirdhaarane cha pravritteh;
sravana-adhyayana-artha-pratishedhaat-smritesh-cha;*

अत्र पूर्वसिद्धान्तन्यायेन पूर्वपक्षप्रवृत्तेः आपवादिकी सङ्गतिः । शूद्रादेः ब्रह्मविद्यायामधिकारः अस्ति उत नेति सन्देहः । विशिष्टबुद्ध्यादिमत्त्वात् देवादिवत् शूद्रस्यापि अस्ति वेदविद्यायामधिकारः इति पूर्वः पक्षः ॥ न च “उपनयीत तमध्यापयीत” इत्युपनीतस्यैव अध्ययनविधानात् शूद्रस्य च अनुपनीततया अध्ययनहीनत्वात् तद्वत् एव “अध्ययनमात्रवतः” (ब्र.सू. ३-४-१२) इति तृतीये अधिकारित्वोक्तेः उक्तं न युक्तमिति वाच्यम् । वैदिकसंवर्गविद्याश्रोतारं पौत्रायणं प्रति “अह हारे त्वा शूद्रे”ति (छा. ४-२-३) वर्णावरे रूढशूद्रपदेन रैक्वस्य संबोधनेन विदुरादेः वेदार्थावधारणादिरूपेण च लिङ्गेन, शूद्रेऽपि उपनयनाध्ययनयोर्वा अनुपनीतस्यैवाध्ययनमिति वा, अनधीयानस्य लिखितनिरीक्षणादिनैव वा, अर्थज्ञानस्य कल्पनादिति ॥

The *poorvapaksha* of this chapter is based on the rule decided in the previous chapter and hence has the sequence of exception with it.

Whether *shoodra* etc are eligible for vedic studies or not is the question. As in the case of deities, even *shoodras* have special intelligence and hence are eligible, says *poorvapaksha*. *Veda* says that one should be inducted into studies through the procedure of *upanayana* and then taught *Vedas*. Since *shoodra* does get *upanayana*, he is not eligible for vedic studies. *Brahma sootra* also speaks of it in *sootra* “*adhyayanamaatravatah*” (3.4.12). This is not true. Sage *Raikva* addressed the ruler *Poutraayana* as “*aha haare tvaa shoodra*” and taught him, a *shoodra*, the vedic *Samvarga vidya*. [The story here is – *Poutraayana* is a pious ruler. He knew the language of birds. One evening while he was lying on the terrace he saw two swans flying over him. One of them said to the other “Look! down below is a pious *Poutraayana*”. The other swan said, “He is nothing compared to the sage *Raikva*”. On listening to this conversation, *Poutraayana* got disturbed and restlessly waited for the dawn to happen, sent his servants to find out where the said sage lives and then he himself went to meet the

sage. He prostrated before the sage, offered his chariot and a precious necklace to him and requested him to teach *Samvarga vidya*. The sage then said, "O! *Shoodra*, let your necklace and chariot be with you"].

The fact of *Vidura* etc having had the knowledge of *Vedas* while themselves being *shoodra* is also an indicator that *Shoodras* can study *Vedas*. Even otherwise, *shoodra* can get the knowledge by

- getting *upanayana* and done, if that is the precondition for studying *vedas* and then studying them
- studying *vedas* even without *upanayana*
- reading the written texts.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ "अयमश्वतरीरथः" इति वाक्यशेषोक्तथवत्वस्य "यत्र वेदो रथस्तत्र न वेदो यत्र नो रथः" इति स्मृत्या रथस्य वेदव्याप्तत्वेन शूद्रे तदभावेन अभावात् क्षत्रिये तस्य स्वाभाविकत्वाच्च । तेन पौत्रायणस्य क्षत्रियत्वावगमेन बाधकेन शूद्रशब्दस्य रूढार्थस्य त्याज्यतया हंसकृतानादरश्रवणजातशोकेन मुनिं प्रति आद्रवणस्य वाक्यशेषे श्रवणेन शुचा द्रवणरूपयोगेन उपपत्त्या शूद्राधिकारा-साधकत्वात् नास्ति शूद्रस्याधिकारः । अध्ययनस्य उपनयनसापेक्षत्वात् शूद्रस्य च "नाग्निर्न यज्ञो न क्रिया संस्कारो न व्रतानि शूद्रस्य" इति श्रुत्या (पैङ्गि श्रु.) उपनयनसंस्काराभावाच्च । "नैतदब्राह्मणो विवक्तुमर्हति" (छां. ४-५-५) इति सत्यकामस्य अशूद्रत्वं निर्धार्यैव तदुपनयने गौतमस्य प्रवृत्तत्वेन तद्रूपाल्लिङ्गात् । "श्रवणे त्रपुजतुभ्यां श्रोत्रपरिपूरणं अध्ययने जिह्वाच्छेदः अर्थावधारणे हृदयविदारणम्" (गौतमधर्मसूत्र) इति शूद्रस्य वेदश्रवणादेर्निषिद्धतया विशिष्टबुद्ध्यादिमत्वे सति अनिषिद्धत्वरूपस्य अधिकारप्रयोजकस्याभावात्, लिखितनिरीक्षणेनापि अर्थावधारणायोगात् । विदुरादेर्जन्मान्तरोत्पन्नज्ञानत्वेन इतरशूद्रवैलक्षण्याच्च नास्ति शूद्रे वेदविद्याधिकार इति ॥ फलं तु शूद्रस्य देवादिवत् विशिष्टबुद्ध्यादिन्यायेन अधिकारे सति तन्निषेधकश्रुत्यादिविरोधप्राप्त्या मनुष्याधिकारित्वं शास्त्रस्य सामान्यतः उक्तं तत्प्रमाणविरुद्धमिति पूर्वपक्षे, सिद्धान्ते सामान्योक्तेः शूद्रेतरविषयत्वान्न विरोधः इति ॥ ९ ॥

As described in *Brahmavaivarta puraana* “*yatra vedo rathastatra..*” there is a rule that only those who are eligible for vedic studies can own a chariot. Thus a *shoodra* would not own a chariot and owning one is natural for a *kshatriya*. In the present case of *Poutraayana*, he is referred to as owning a chariot drawn by mules. Hence it can be understood that he was a *kshatriya*. In view of this hurdle, the word *shoodra* in the quoted text of *upanishat* cannot be taken by its apparent meaning but has to be understood by its etymological meaning. Thus in view of the running on account of displeasure caused by the belittling words of the swan, as described in the same *Upanishat*, he is addressed as *shoodra* (*shu + dra : shuchaa* – on account of the displeasure, *aadravanam* – running), the expression does stand to testify eligibility for *shoodra* class.

The vedic studies have a prerequisite of *upanayana* for the student. This is not available for a *shoodra*. *Paingee shruti* says “*Shoodra* is not eligible for the vedic aspects of *agni – yajna, kriya – tasks, samskaara – procedures and vrata – religious abstinence like fasting*”. Thus, a *shoodra* would not get the *upanayana* procedure done for him and without that he is not eligible for vedic studies.

There is a narrative in the *upanishat*. One boy approaches the sage *Goutama* and pleads for vedic knowledge. The sage asks him what his *gotra* – lineage is. The boy says he does not know. He is advised to get that information from his mother. Even the mother expresses ignorance. The boy sincerely speaks the truth that even his mother does not know. The sage draws an inference that the boy must be a *brahmana* by his sincerity in speaking the truth and performs *upanayana* and teaches him the vedic texts. The boy is named *Satyakaama*.

The above story also confirms that *Upanayana* is essential and that the said procedure was done to *Satyakaama* after ascertaining him being a *brahmana*.

One of the books by name “*Goutama dharma sootra*” specifically prohibits vedic studies with the expression “*shravane trapu-jataabhyaam..*” If a person who is not eligible for vedic studies listens to *veda*, his ears should be filled with led and lac, if he recites, his tongue be cut off and if he understands, his heart be torn”. In view of such a prohibition, a *shoodra* is not eligible for vedic studies even if he possesses the required higher intelligence. Since there is a prohibition even for understanding, the argument that *shoodra* can know the subject by reading the books also does not hold good.

In the case of certain learned persons like *Vidura* who are *shoodras*, the vedic knowledge in them is on account of the same being acquired in their previous births and not when they are born as *shoodras*. Hence it gets concluded that a *shoodra* is not eligible for vedic studies.

The benefit of this chapter lies in contending that the expression that “humans are eligible for vedic studies” is invalid since *shoodras* are counted as ineligible even in spite of them having special intelligence, like deities, consequent to the prohibition and a resolution by stating that the statement “humans are eligible” is a generic one and has exceptions through prohibitions.

॥ ॐ कम्पनात् ॐ ॥ १० ॥

kampanaat - 10

अत्र वज्रशब्दस्य पूर्वत्र शूद्रशब्दस्येव वाक्यशेषे कृतयोगाभावात् योगवृत्त्या न विष्णुवाचित्वमिति शङ्कनात्प्रत्युदाहरणसङ्गतिः । “यदिदं किञ्च जगत्सर्वं पाण

एजति निःसृतम् । महद्भयं वज्रमुद्यतं य एतद्विदुः अमृतास्ते भवन्ति ।” इति (का.२-३-२) काठके श्रुतो वज्रः किं इन्द्रायुधं उत विष्णुरिति सन्देहः । इन्द्रायुधमिति पूर्वः पक्षः ॥ वज्रशब्दस्य तत्र रुढत्वात् । वाक्यशेषे पूर्वत्रेव विष्णौ कृमयोगाभावात् “वर्जनाद्वज्र”मिति (ब्र.वै.पु.) स्मृतेश्च वज्रश्रुतितः दुर्बलत्वात् । कृमरुढित्यागेन यौगिकतया विष्णुग्रहणे च अर्थान्तरेऽपि योगस्य सुवचत्वेन शब्दार्थाव्यवस्थाप्रसङ्गाच्च उद्यतत्वलिङ्गाच्च तस्य च “उद्यतायुधदोर्दण्डाः” (महाभारत) इत्यादिस्मृतौ “तेनेन्द्रो वज्रमुदयच्छत्” इति श्रुतौ च आयुधे प्रसिद्धत्वात् श्रुतिलिङ्गाभ्यां च मुक्तिहेतुवेदनत्वादिब्रह्मलिङ्गानां बाधादिति ॥

This chapter deals with the word “*Vajra*” speaking of *Vishnu*. While the word “*shoodra*” was considered in the previous chapter with its etymological meaning to describe the one who came running on account of displeasure, similar thing is not possible with the word “*vajra*”, for it does not have a definitive etymology. Thus this chapter has a sequence of a counter illustration with the previous one.

The word “*vajra*” as can be seen in *Kaathaka upanishat* in its mantra that says that everything in this universe, be it within *praana* or outside of him, is scared of the raised *vajra* and the one who knows this *Vajra* will attain *moksha*. Whether this *Vajra* is the weapon of deity *Indra* or *Vishnu* is the question.

The *Poorvapaksha* says, it is the weapon of deity *Indra* that is referred to by the word “*Vajra*”. It is here that the usage of the word exists. The context does not permit any etymological meaning that would describe *Vishnu* by that word. The *smriti* that says “*varjanaat vajra uchyate* – He is called *vajra* because of him being devoid (of defects) is weak vis-a-vis *sruti* – the name. If a definitive meaning based on the usage is to be discarded and some vague etymological meaning has to be accepted to fit it for *Vishnu*,

in a similar effort some other meaning can also be derived and it leads to a situation where no specific meaning can be derived from the words. This apart the description “raised” suits a weapon and not *Vishnu*. Similar usage can be seen in *Mahabharata* where it says “*udyataayudha-dordandah*” and in *vedas* as “*tenendro vajram udayacchat*”. Since *sruti* (name) and *linga* (description) are powerful put together vis-a-vis only *linga* (in favour of *Vishnu*) where it says the one knowing *vajra* attains *moksha* (hence the *linga* is in favour of *Vishnu*) gets subdued.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ “जगत्सर्वं प्राण एजति” प्राणनिमित्तं कम्पते इति श्रुतसर्व-
चेष्टकत्वस्य “को ह्येवान्यात्कः प्राण्यात्” (तै.उ. २-७) इत्यादिश्रुतिस्मृतिभिः
विष्णोरन्यत्रानवकाशात् । वज्रश्रुतेश्च श्रुत्युपबृंहकस्मृत्युक्तेन निरवकाशयोगेन
“आयुधानामहं वज्रं” इति (भ.गी. १०-२८) प्रयोगाच्च विष्णौ सावकाशत्वात् ।
योगस्य स्मार्तत्वादेव अव्यवस्थानापत्तेः । उद्यतत्वलिङ्गस्य च उत्पूर्वस्य
यतेरुपतया उत्कृष्टप्रयत्नवत्त्वरूपतया विष्णावपि सम्भवात् इदं वज्रं विष्णुरेवेति
॥ फलं तु विष्णोः मुक्तिहेतुवेदनत्वाक्षेपः तत्समाधिश्च ॥ १० ॥

In the quoted text of *upanishat* it is said that the entire of universe is scared of *Vajra*. The word “*kampati*” literally means “shakes”. Thus, while it can mean “scared” it also means “vibrates / moves”, signifying an activity. Every activity is thus caused by *Vajra*. *taittireeya upanishat* says “who else can motivate and activate the world if it is not *aakaasha* (read *Vishnu*), who is full of pleasure?”. Thus the attribute of activating everything is unique to *Vishnu* and hence *Vajra* here refers to *Vishnu*. As regards the name “*Vajra*” that is counted as a strong indicator for interpretation, it also fits in *Vishnu* on account of its non-accommodative etymological meaning as described by *smriti*. *Smritis* are considered as complementary to *vedas*. In *Bhagavad Geeta*, *Krishna* says “I am *Vajra* amongst the weapons” thus indicating the name *vajra* to be accommodative for *Vishnu*. The objection of a possible chaos in

arriving at the meaning if etymology is followed does not apply in this case since such a meaning is provided by *Smṛiti*. As regards the component “*udyat* – raised” in the quoted statement of *upanishat*, it can be understood to mean *ut* + *yat*, where *ut* means “super” and *yat* means “effort” signifying the extraordinary activity of *Vishnu*. Hence it is only *Vishnu* who is referred to by the word *vajra* in the quoted text.

The benefit of this chapter lies in raising an objection that *Vajra*, which is referred to as the provider of *moksha* is not *Vishnu* and its resolution.

॥ ॐ ज्योतिर्दर्शनात् ॐ ॥ ११ ॥

jyotirdarshanaat - 11

अत्र पूर्वत्रेव निरवकाशजीवलिङ्गात् ज्योतिःशब्दस्य “विष्णुरेव ज्योतिः” इति श्रुतिप्रसिद्धार्थत्यागेन पूर्वपक्षप्रवृत्तेः आपवादकी सङ्गतिः। काण्वश्रुतौ पष्ठेऽध्याये “योऽयं विज्ञानमयः प्राणेषु हृद्यन्तर्ज्योतिः” इति (बृ. ६-३-७) श्रुतं ज्योतिः किं जीवः उत ब्रह्मेति सन्देहः । जीव इति पूर्वः पक्षः । “स समानः सन्नुभौ लोकावनुसञ्चरति” (बृ. ६-३-७) “स वाऽयं पुरुषो जायमानः शरीरमभिसम्पद्यमानः पाप्मभिः संसृज्यते । स उत्क्रामन् म्रियमाणः पाप्मनो विजहाती” इति (बृ. ६-३-८) कर्मायत्तलोकसञ्चणादिजीवलिङ्गबाहुल्यात् । किंच “किं ज्योतिरयं पुरुषः” इति प्रश्ने (बृ. ६-३-२) “आदित्येनैव ज्योतिषाऽऽस्ते” इत्यादिना आदित्यचन्द्राग्निवागात्मसु पूर्वपूर्वास्तमये उत्तरोत्तरस्य ज्ञानहेतुत्वरूपज्योतिष्वमुक्त्वा “कतम आत्मा” इति प्रश्ने (बृ. ६-३-७) योऽयमित्यस्योक्तत्वात् आदित्यादिज्योतिष्वेनोक्तस्य च न तत्र सूर्यो भातीत्यादेः विष्णुत्वायोगेन जीवत्वावश्यभावाच्च । आत्मशब्देन परमात्मग्रहणे सति अस्तमयादिहीनात्मज्योतिष्वस्य जीवे सार्वकालिकत्वेन आदित्येनैव ज्योतिषेत्यादौ अवधारणायोगादिति ॥

As in the case of previous chapter, even here the *poorvapaksha* bases its arguments on the non-accommodative nature of the indicator “*jyothi*” that speaks of *jeeva* and raises an objection on adopting the meaning of the said word in favour of *Vishnu* as found in the vedic text “*vishnureva jyothih*”. Hence has the sequence of objection with the previous chapter.

Whether the word “*jyothih*” as seen in the statement “*yoyam vijnaanamayah praaneshu hridyantarjyothih*” of *Brihadaaranyaka upanishat* refers to *jeeva* or *Brahma* is the question. *Poorvapaksha* says it refers to *jeeva*. For, the same *upanishat* says “He moves in both the worlds while remaining unaffected”, “The same person who is getting born again takes birth along with his sins and while dying, leaves the body on account of sins”. These statements depicting movement between the worlds on account of *karma* form multiple pointers to indicate the one addressed by the word *jyothi* be *jeeva*. In a conversation available in the same *upanishat*, there is a question as to what is *jyothi* and the reply is “*aaditya* - Sun”. In his absence, it is *Chandrama* – Moon and so on calling Sun, Moon, Fire, Speech and *aatma* as *jyothi*. Then, in response to the question as to who is this *aatma*, the reply is “*yoyam*” etc quoted above. This *jyothi* is described as the light of *aaditya* etc. It cannot be *Vishnu* since he has been described as “*na tatra suryo bhaati* – he cannot be illuminated by Sun”. Hence *jyothi* must be *jeeva*.

If *jyothi* were to be considered as God because of the word “*aatma*”, then in view of the light of *aatma* being continuous without a rise and set, the expressions “*aadityenaiva jyothishaa* – He remains active on account of the light of Sun alone” etc where the word “alone” is used does not fit in.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ “विष्णुरेव ज्योतिः विष्णुरेव ब्रह्म” (चतुर्वेदशिखा) इति श्रुत्या ज्योतिःशब्दस्य विष्णवेकवाचित्वात्तस्य हृद्यन्तर्ज्योतिरिति उपक्रमे “अत्रायं

पुरुषः स्वयं ज्योतिरिति (बृ. ६-३-९) उपसंहारे च श्रुतत्वेन ताभ्यां विष्णुपरत्वेन निर्णीतवाक्यमध्यपतितत्वेन जीवलिङ्गानां अन्तर्णीतण्यर्थकत्व-कल्पनया हरौ सावकाशत्वात् लोकद्वयसञ्चारस्य जीवमादाय ईशस्यैव स्वातन्त्र्येणोपपत्तेः, आत्मशब्दितेशस्य ज्योतिष्वेऽपि जीवस्य बाह्य-ज्योतिःप्राधान्यज्ञापनाय आदित्येनैवेत्यवधारणोपपत्तेः विष्णुरेवेदं ज्योतिरिति ॥ फलं तु हृदयाहितत्वमुखेन ज्योतिश्चरणेति सूत्राक्षेपः समाधिश्चेति ॥ ११॥

Vishnu alone is the one addressed by the word “jyothi”, for

- *Chaturveda shikha* text assertively states Vishnu alone is *jyothi* and Vishnu alone is *Brahma*.

The referred *mantra* has “*hridyantar-jyothih*” in the beginning and “*atraayam purushah svayam jyothih*” in the concluding *mantra*. Both of them speak of Vishnu. The referred text under discussion (“*sa samaanassan ubhou lokaavanu-sancharati*” speaking of movement between the two worlds) falls in between the two expressions speaking of Vishnu.

The indicators pointing at *jeeva* are flexible to accommodate Vishnu as the one dwelling in *jeevas* as their regulator.

Travel to the two worlds also fits in Vishnu because it is he who carries the *jeevas* to the said worlds and is the one who travels independently.

Though God addressed by the word *aatma* is himself the light, the expression illuminated only by Sun etc is with reference to *jeeva* being illuminated primarily by the external light.

The benefit of this chapter lies in raising an objection on the conclusion of the earlier *sootra* “*jyotis-charana-abhidhaanaat*” that the one residing in the heart is Vishnu and its resolution.

॥ ॐ आकाशोऽर्थान्तरत्वादिव्यपदेशात् ॐ ॥ १२ ॥

aakaasho-arthaantaratvaadi-vyapadeshaat - 12

अत्र "बहिष्कुलायादमृतश्चरित्वे"ति (बृ. ६-३-१२) पूर्वज्योतिषि श्रुतामृतत्वस्य इहाकाशो "तदमृत"मिति श्रवणात् तस्य च अन्यत्वात् पूर्वोक्तमपि अन्यदित्याक्षेपात् आक्षेपिकी सङ्गतिः । छान्दोग्ये "आकाशो वै नाम नामरूपयोर्निर्वहिता ते यदन्तरा तद्ब्रह्म तदमृतम्" इत्यन्तिमखण्डे (छां. ८-१४-१) श्रुताकाशः किं प्रसिद्धाव्याकृताकाशः किं वा ब्रह्मेति सन्देहः । पूर्वपक्षस्तु वै नामेति निपातद्वयस्य प्रसिद्धार्थत्वात् तस्य च "आकाशो वै नाम" प्रसिद्धः खल्वाकाशः "नामरूपयोर्निर्वहिते"ति उद्देशान्वये आकाशो नामरूपयोर्निर्वहिता, वै नाम तस्य नामरूपनिर्वोद्धृत्वं प्रसिद्धमिति विधेयान्वये वा द्वेधापि स्वरूपेण नामरूपावकाशदानात् तन्निर्वाहकतया च लोके अवकाश एव प्रसिद्धेः ईशे अप्रसिद्धेः अवकाश एव अयमाकाश इति ॥

In the previous chapter, we have known *jyothi* as *Vishnu*. The same *Brihadaraanyaka upanishat* that was the basis of discussion there, calls *Jyothi* as *Amrita* in its expression "*bahishkulaayaad amrita-shcharitvaa*" where *Amrita* is described as taking out, though rarely, an *amsha* of *jeeva* to show him the dreams. The same name "*Amrita*" can be seen for *Aakaasha* elsewhere. Since *Aakaasha* is someone else, the reference to *jyothi* must also be with someone else is the objection, based on which this chapter begins. Hence it has the sequence of objection with the previous one.

Chandogya upanishat in its last *khanda* (section) says "*aakaasha* is the one who manages the names and objects addressed by such names. The one who is different from these names and objects is *Brahma* and he is *Amrita*". Whether *Akaasha* referred to here is the well known "*avyaakrita aakaasha* – absolute space" or *Brahma* is the question. (There are two types of spaces viz. The absolute one called "*avyaakrita aakaasha*" that eternally exists everywhere and

the other one is “*praakrita aakaasha*” that is created within *avyaakrita aakaasha* and it ceases to exist during delusion. This *praakrita aakaasha* stays with other matter like *prithivi*, water etc).

The *pooravapaksha* says it is the popular space that is addressed as *aakasha* in the referred text. For,

- There are two words “*vai*” and “*naama*” both of which mean popularity. When both these words are used along with the word “*aakaasha*”, the sentence lays emphasis on the popularity of usage. It thus means “It certainly is this popularly known *aakaasha* that manages the names and their objects”. In other words, it means “It is well known fact that *aakaasha* manages the names and objects”.

It is *aakaasha*, the space that is known to accommodate all objects and their names.

The word *aakaasha* is not known in the world as belonging to *Vishnu*.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ “ते यदन्तरा” इति वाक्ये ते नामरूपे विना यदस्तीत्युक्तस्य कात्स्न्येन शब्दागोचरत्वादिरूपानामत्वस्य तथा निर्वाह्यतया प्रकृतप्राकृत-रूपराहित्यस्य च लिङ्गस्य “यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते” (ते. २-४) “अरूपमस्पर्श” (का. ३-१५) इत्यादि श्रुतिभिः “अनामा सोऽप्रसिद्धत्वात् अरूपो भूतवर्जनात्” (ब्राह्म पु.) इत्यादिस्मृत्या च विष्ण्वेकधर्मत्वात् तद्ब्रह्मेत्युक्तब्रह्मशब्दात् तदमृतमित्युक्तामृतत्वलिङ्गाच्च साधकसत्तत्वात् प्रसिद्धार्थकनिपातद्वयस्य च “आकाश इति होवाच” इति श्रुतौ (छां. १-९-१) स्वरूपेण “एको दाधार भुवनानि विश्वे”त्यादि श्रुतौ (ऋ. सं. १-५४-४) नामरूपनिर्वोद्धत्वेन च विष्णौ प्रसिद्धत्वात् वेदप्रसिद्धेः अन्तरङ्गतया वेदे ग्राह्यत्वेनाबाधकत्वात् अयमाकाशो विष्णुरेवेति ॥ फलं तु नामरूपनिर्वोद्धत्वाख्यसर्वाधारत्वमुखेन द्युभ्वादिनयाक्षेपः तत्समाधिश्च तल्लिङ्गादित्यत्र अनवकाशलिङ्गेन लोकरुढित्यागोक्तावपीह वै नामेत्याभ्यां विशेषशङ्कया पुनरारम्भः ॥ १२ ॥

In the referred text of *Chandogya Upanishat*, *aakaasha* is referred to as the one who is different from names and forms. It is only *Vishnu* who cannot be known fully through names and is beyond the material forms. Such a quality is affirmed by the vedic texts “*yato vaacho nivartante* – whom the words cannot reach”, “*aroopam asparsham* – one who does not have a form and non palpable”. *Brahmanda purana* clarifies – He does not have a name because he is not popular (cannot be described fully by any name) and is without any form since he does not have any material form. These descriptions fit only in *Vishnu* and not in space.

Aakaasha is described as “*Brahma*” and “*amrita* – eternal”. The said name and the quality of eternity on all counts are unique to *Vishnu*. The two expressions “*vai*” and “*naama*” indicating popularity also fit in to *Vishnu* since *Chandogya Upanishat* says “*aakaasha iti ho vacha* – He is famous as *Aakaasha*” and “*eko daadhaara bhuvanaani vishva* – He alone is managing all the worlds”. Since vedic popularity is internal to *vedas*, the vedic text referring to such a popularity is perfectly valid. Hence the one referred to by the name *aakaasha* is *Vishnu* alone.

By describing some one else as the support of the worlds *dyu* and *bhu* through the indicators of him being the administrator of names and forms, an objection is raised on the conclusion that such a person is *Vishnu* and this forms the benefit of *poorvapaksha*. Its resolution forms the benefit of *Siddhanta*.

Though the word *aakaasha* is shown to refer *Vishnu* alone in the earlier chapter “*aakaashas-tallingaat*”, it has been done so there using the non-accommodative attributes available in favour of *Vishnu* rejecting the contentions of popularity of usage in the

world. This chapter however deals with the specific doubt based on the attributes of administering names and forms.

॥ ॐ सुषुप्त्युत्क्रान्त्योर्भेदेन ॐ ॥ १३ ॥

Sushuptyut-kraantyor-bhedena - 13

अत्र प्रागाकाशशब्दस्य श्रौतप्रसिद्ध्या ईशे सम्भवेऽपि इह तदभावात् न स्वप्नद्रष्टृत्वं युक्तमिति वा आकाशस्य जडत्वेन तत्र ईशलिङ्गस्य ईशभेदेनायोगेऽपि इह जीवस्य ईशाभेदेन तल्लिङ्गं नेतुं शक्यते इति वा पूर्ववैषम्येण शङ्कनात्सङ्गतिः । काण्वश्रुतौ अष्टमेऽध्याये "स वा एष एतस्मिन् सम्प्रसादे रत्वा चरित्वा दृष्ट्वैव पुण्यं च पापं च पुनः प्रतिन्यायं प्रतियोन्या द्रवति स्वप्नायैव स यत्तत्र किञ्चित्पश्यति अनन्वागतस्तेन भवत्यसङ्गो ह्ययं पुरुषः" इति (बृ. ६-३-१५) श्रुतस्वप्नादिद्रष्टा किं जीवः अथ ईशा इति सन्देहः । स्वप्नादिद्रष्टृत्वस्य लोके जीव एव प्रसिद्धत्वात् जीव इति पूर्वः पक्षः ॥ श्रौतप्रसिद्ध्यभावे लोकप्रसिद्धेरपि वेदे ग्राह्यत्वात् ईशस्याशरीरत्वेन स्वप्नादिद्रष्टृत्वायोगाच्च । असङ्गत्वरूपब्रह्मलिङ्गस्य ईशाभेदेन जीवचैतन्येऽपि युक्तत्वात् । जीवधर्मस्य तु स्वप्नादि द्रष्टृत्वस्य शुद्धे ब्रह्मचैतन्ये अयोगात् । जिज्ञासासूत्रे जीवेशभेदस्योक्ततया तदभेदाभिप्रायेण तद्धर्मस्येशे सिद्धान्तिना वक्तुमशक्यत्वाच्चेति ॥

Though the word *aakaasha* could be accommodated to speak of *Vishnu* based on the vedic usage and popularity, the same cannot be done here in the case of the attribute of being the viewer of dreams. Alternatively, while the subject of reference in the previous chapter, "the sky" being *jada* and hence different from God the qualities of God could not be fit in, in the present case, *jeeva* being no different from God, the attributes indicating God can also be fit in to *jeeva*. This chapter begins with these possibilities causing the doubt and hence has the sequential reference with its previous one.

In the sixth *adhyaya* of *Brihadaraanyaka upanishat*, we find a narration about “dreams” wherein it says “This person, while asleep enjoys, moves around, after seeing the sins and virtues, moves to the neck area for securing the deserved dreams in the sequence that is fit and proper and does so in every birth. He remains untainted by those and hence this person is considered as *asanga*”. Whether this person who is referred to as watching dreams is *jeeva* or God is the question. *Poorvapaksha* says, the one who watches dreams etc should be *jeeva*, for it is he who is known for that in the world. In the absence of a popular expression in *vedas*, the worldly popularity needs to be adopted. As for God, he does not have a body and hence cannot see dreams. As regards the attribute “*asanga*”, though it is specific to God, it can be considered for *jeeva* as well, since *jeeva* and God are one. While the quality of God can be attributed to *jeeva*, the converse, i.e., *jeeva*’s quality of seeing dreams cannot be applied to God who is pure and has no attributes. This apart, since the *siddhantis* have, in the very first *sootra*, advocated God and *jeeva* as different, they cannot now argue for considering the attribute of *jeeva* in God.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ असङ्गोऽह्यमिति श्रुतासङ्गत्वस्य असङ्गमस्पर्शमित्यादिना ईशैकधर्मत्वात् स्वाप्नादिपदार्थानां “सन्ध्ये सृष्टिराह ही”ति (ब्र. सू. ३-१-१) वक्ष्यमाणन्यायेन सत्यत्वेन “यस्सर्वज्ञः” इत्यादिश्रुत्या (आथ. १-९) ईशस्य सर्वज्ञतया च कात्स्न्येन स्वप्रादिद्रष्टृत्वस्य ईशे मुख्यतः सम्भवात् । “प्राज्ञेनात्मना सम्परिष्वक्तः” (बृ. ६-३-२१) “प्राज्ञेनात्मना अन्वारुढ” (बृ. ६-३-३५) इति सुषुप्त्युत्क्रान्तिप्रकरणयोः भेदोक्त्या जीवेशाभेदा-श्रयणायोगात् । “स्वाप्ययसम्पत्यो”रित्यत्र (ब्र. सू. ४-४-१६) सुषुप्तिप्रकरणस्य मुक्तिपरत्वस्याप्युक्त्या भेदस्य मुक्तिगतत्वेन सत्यत्वाच्च स्वाप्नादिद्रष्टा विष्णुरेवेति । फलं तु अक्षरनयोक्तस्य असङ्गत्वस्य आक्षेपः तत्समाधिश्च ॥ १३ ॥

The quality of being *asanga* as described in vedas (*asango hi ayam purushah*) belongs to only God as confirmed by another vedic text “*asangam asparsham*” etc. In the upcoming chapter “*sandhye srishti..*”, it will be made clear that the objects seen in dreams are true. Since God is described as “*yah sarvajnah sarvavit*” omniscient, the attribute of seeing the dreams primarily fits in him, who sees all dreams of everyone. *Brihadaaranyaka upanishat* describes *jeeva* as the one enclosed by *Praajna* form of God while in sleep and as the one carrying *Praajna* while leaving the body. The enclosure and the enclosed ought to be different. So is the case with the one carrying and the carried. Hence *jeeva* and God are different. They cannot be considered as one to attribute the quality of God to *jeeva*. In a *sootra* “*swaapyaya-sampatyoh*” in the last section of *Brahma sootras*, the chapter on sleep in *Brihadaaranyaka upanishat* (that has been the subject of discussion here) is interpreted to speak of *moksha*. Thus, the difference between *jeeva* and God stays firm even in *moksha*.

Thus, the one who is referred to as a viewer of dreams is *Vishnu* alone.

The benefit of this chapter lies in taking an objection on considering *akshara* as *Vishnu* as concluded in the chapter “*aksharam ambaraantah..*” and its resolution.

॥ ॐ पत्यादिशब्देभ्यः ॐ ॥ १४ ॥

patyaadi-shabdebhyah - 14

अत्र “असङ्गो नहि सज्जत” (बृ. ६-४-२२) इत्युक्तस्यासङ्गस्य ईशान्यत्वे प्राक्तनोऽपि स एवेति शङ्कनात् आक्षेपिकी सङ्गतिः । काण्वश्रुतौ षष्ठेऽध्याये “एष नित्यो महिमा ब्राह्मणस्ये”ति (बृ. ६-४-२२) श्रुतः ब्राह्मणः किं विरिञ्चः किं वा ईश इति सन्देहः । विरिञ्च एवायं ब्राह्मणः इति पूर्वः पक्षः ॥ “स वा एष महानज

आत्मा" (बृ. ६-४-२२) इत्यजशब्दात् तस्य च अकारवाच्येशजातत्वेन योगेन रूढ्या च विरिञ्चे सम्भवात् ईशेन जायत इति योगेन "तस्मादहमजः स्मृत" इति भारतीकृत्या रूढ्या च सम्भवेऽपि वर्णहीने विष्णावनवकाशेन विप्रत्वजातौ निरुद्धब्राह्मणशब्दसाहित्येन अस्य विरिञ्चैकप्रापकत्वात् महच्छब्दस्यापि अभिमानिनयन्यायेन महत्तत्वाभिमानिनि विरिञ्च एव युक्तत्वात् आत्मश्रुतेरपि "आत्मा विरिञ्चः सुमना" इत्युक्तेः "बुद्धेरात्मा महान् परः" इति प्रयोगात् विरिञ्चे रूढत्वात् । सर्वस्य वशीत्यादिनोक्तब्रह्मलिङ्गानां तु उभयबाधेन विरिञ्चेशाभेदेन पूर्वपूर्वपक्षवदुपपत्तेः । "स्थित्यादये हरिविरिञ्चहरेति सज्ञा" (भाग. १-२-२३) इत्यादेः अभेदेनैकवाक्यत्वोपपत्तौ वाक्यभेदेनोभयपरत्वकल्पनायोगाच्चेति ॥

If the one referred to as *asanga* in the statement "*asango nahi sajjate*" in *Brihadāraṇyaka upanishat* is not *Vishnu*, then the one discussed in the previous chapter should also be other than *Vishnu*. This chapter begins with this doubt and has the sequence of objection with its previous one.

Brihadāraṇyaka upanishat says "*esha nityo mahimaa braahmanasya* – this eternal glory is of *brahmana*". Whether this "*brahmana*" is *Virincha* (*chaturmukha*) or God is the question. The *poorvapaksha* says, it is certainly *Virincha*. For, the same *mantra* describes him as "*sa vaa esha mahaan aja aatmaa*". The word *aja* speaks of *Virincha* both by the usage and the etymology that describes him to be born to "अ – a". Though the word can etymologically fit in to *Vishnu* as the one who is not born (*na jaayate – aja*) and that such an interpretation is supported by the usage as can be seen in *Mahabharata* that quotes "*tasmaadaham ajah smritah*", the word *Brahmana* that speaks of caste cannot fit into *Vishnu* who is beyond the castes. This fits in to *Virincha* only. Even the word *mahat* speaks of *Virincha* as he is the regulator of *mahat tatva* as described in the chapter "*abhimani vyapadeshastu..*". Even the word *aatma* also fits in *Virincha* by the usage as can be seen in "*buddher-aatmaa mahaan parah*". As far

the other attributes like “*sarvasya vashee*” described in the referred text of *upanishat*, though they are specific to *Vishnu*, they can be attributed to *Virincha* since both are one and the same as contended in the previous chapter. *Bhagavata* in its statement “*sthityaadaye hari-virincha-hareti samjnaah*” indicates *Hari*, *Virincha* and *Hara* as one and the same by placing them in one sentence. There is no reason to break the sentence and consider them as different.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ “सर्वस्य वशी सर्वस्येशानः सर्वस्याधिपतिः” इत्यादिनोक्तसर्व-
वशित्वादिलिङ्गानां “उतामृतत्वस्येशानः” (पुरुष सू.) “सप्तार्धगर्भ” (क. १-
१६४-३६) इत्यादिश्रुतिभ्यो वैष्णवत्वात् । ब्राह्मणशब्दस्य ब्रह्मणा वेदेन
अण्यते गम्यते इति योगेन सावकाशत्वात् अजश्रुतेः तथैव सावकाशत्वात्
उभयबाधेन अभेदाङ्गीकारस्य अतिप्रसञ्जकतया “तत एते व्यजायन्त विश्वो
हिरण्यगर्भः” इत्यादिवचनबाधिततया च अयोगात् । स्मृतेश्च
तत्तदन्तर्गतेश्वररूपापेक्षया उपपत्तेः अयं ब्राह्मणो विष्णुरेवेति ॥ फलं तु
जिज्ञासादिसूत्रेषु विष्णोः विवक्षितं नित्यमहिमत्वमयुक्तं इत्याक्षेपः तत्समाधिश्चेति
॥१४ ॥

Brihadaaranyaka upanishat speaks of glory of the referred *Brahmana* as “*sarvasya vashee sarvasya eeshaanah sarvasya adhipatih* – He controls everything, he is the lord of *Brahma* and *Rudra*, he is the lord of everyone”. Hence he must be *Vishnu*. In similar expressions, *Purusha sookta* says “he is not just the lord of this universe but is so even for the world of *muktas*” and *Rig veda* says “the deities regulating the seven elements that have grown well and form the core material for this universe are constantly under his directions”, confirming this fact. The word *Brahmana* means the one who can be known through *Brahma* – *vedas* and thus accommodates *Vishnu*. The word *aja* also fits in *Vishnu* as the one who is never born. In view of the obstacles in considering *Brahmana* as *Vishnu* getting thus removed, considering *Virincha* and *Vishnu* as one is superfluous. Such a consideration is also

incorrect in view of the scripts saying that this universe and *Hiranyagarbha* (*Virincha*) are created by Him. As regards the quoted text of *Bhagavata*, it should be understood to refer to the forms of God lying inside *Virincha* etc.

The benefit of this chapter lies in raising an objection to the eternal glory of *Vishnu* as pointed in the earlier *sootras* like *athaatho brahma jijnaasa* etc and its resolution.

॥ इति श्रीराघेन्द्रयतिकृतायां न्यायमुक्तावल्यां आद्येऽध्याये तृतीयः पादः ॥

प्रथमाध्याये चतुर्थः पादः

एवं त्रिपाद्यां कारणत्वतत्सङ्गतानन्दमयत्वादिगुणान्तरबोधक-
वाक्यस्थशब्दसमन्वयेऽभिहिते अत्र ब्रह्मपदोक्तगुणपूर्तिसिद्धये अवसरप्राप्तानां
अन्यत्रैव प्रसिद्धनामलिङ्गात्मकशब्दानां समन्वय उच्यते ॥

The previous three sections discussed on how the words, describing the quality of being the creator of the universe and the words that appeared in the sentences speaking of the qualities incidental to such creation such as *aanandamayatva*, spoke of *Vishnu* alone. This section deals with the incidental words that appear to speak of only those other than *Vishnu* either by their name or by the attributes they speak of and shows them to be primarily speaking of *Vishnu*.

॥ ॐ आनुमानिकमप्येकेषामिति चेन्न शरीररूपकविन्यस्तगृहीतेदर्शयति च ॐ ॥
१॥

*Aanumaanikam-apyekeshaamiti chenna shareera-roopaka-
vinyasta-griheeter-darshayati cha - 1*

॥ ॐ सूक्ष्मं तु तदर्हवात् ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ तदधीनत्वादर्थवत् ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ
ज्ञेयत्वावचनाच्च ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ वदतीति चेन्न प्राज्ञो हि ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ प्रकरणात् ॐ ॥
॥ ॐ त्रयाणामेव चैवमुपन्यासः प्रश्नश्च ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ महद्वच्च ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ
चमसवदविशेषात् ॐ ॥

*sookshmam tu tadarhatvaat; tad-adheenatvaad-arthavat; jneyatva-
avachanaaccha; vadateeti chenna prajno hi; prakaranaat; trayaanaameva
chaivam-upanyaasah prashnascha; mahadvaccha; chamasavad-
avisheshaat;*

अत्र अव्यक्तादिपरावधित्वावरत्वादिवाचिशब्दवाच्यत्वे प्राक्
हेतूक्तसर्वेश्वरत्वादिविरोध इत्याशङ्कनात् पूर्वसङ्गतिः ध्येया । "महतः

परमव्यक्तमव्यक्तात्पुरुषः परः" (का. १-३-११) "जीवा एवतु दुःखिनः" "योनिमन्ये प्रपद्यन्ते" (का. २-२-७) "कार्यकारणबद्धौतौ" (मां. २-११) इत्यादौ श्रुताव्यक्तदुःखिबद्ध-अवरादिशब्दमुख्यार्थः किं प्रकृतिजीवादिः उत ईशः इति सन्देहः ॥ पूर्वपक्षस्तु ॥ प्रकृत्यादिरेव अव्यक्तादिशब्दार्थः न ब्रह्म, अव्यक्तादिशब्दानां तत्रैव प्रसिद्धेः विष्णुवाचित्वे मानाभावात् । तेषां प्रधानाद्यवाचकत्वेऽपि तत्र व्यवहारे, अविशेषेण सर्वशब्दानां सर्वत्र व्यवहारापातेन अव्यवस्थाप्रसङ्गाच्च । अव्यक्ते पञ्चम्युक्तेन परावधित्वेनाक्षिप्तावरत्वस्य जीवे ज्ञातदुःखित्वादेश्च "न त्वत्समश्चाभ्याधिकश्च दृश्यते" (भ.गी. ११-४३) "निरनिष्टो निरवद्यः" इत्यादिप्रमाणविरोधेन प्रागुक्तसर्वाधिपतित्वादिविरोधेन च विष्णावयोगाच्च । "महान्तं च समावृत्य प्रधानं समवस्थितं" इत्यादेः प्रधानधर्मत्वेन निर्णीतमहत्परत्वलिङ्गस्य अव्यक्ते श्रवणाच्चेति ॥

This chapter deals with those words like *avyakta* that speak of one being *avadhi*, the reference point and indicating inferiority. If these words are shown to speak *Vishnu*, it would contradict the supremacy etc that were shown as the reason for him being the creator of the universe. This forms the base of this chapter and hence has the sequence with the earlier chapter.

Kaathakopanishat says "*avyakta* is superior to *mahat* and *purusha* is superior to *avyakta*". In another statement it says "It is only *jeevas* that have pain" and "others get born". *Mandukopanishat* says "these two are bound by effect and cause". Whether the persons referred to by the words *avyakta*, *dukhi* (one having pain), *baddha* (bound) speak primarily of *prakriti* (matter and its regulating deity), *Jeeva* etc or of God is the question.

Poorvapaksha – The words *avyakta* etc speak of only *prakriti* etc and not *Brahma*. For, their usage exists in them only and there is no evidence to show that they speak of *Vishnu*. Had it been that

they do not speak of *prakriti* etc but still are used as such, then on the same ground, any word would have been used for anything leading to chaos. In the case of *avyakta*, it has been used in the quoted text as reference point to indicate someone else's supremacy, thus indicating its inferiority. Similarly, the one known to have pain is *jeeva*. These qualities cannot be considered for *Vishnu*. For, *Bhagavad geeta* says "there is none who is equal to you nor is there a superior", the scripts describe *Vishnu* as "the one having nothing undesirable and no components" etc. Considering *Vishnu* as *avyakta* or *dukhi* would contradict these scripts and also the quality of being master of all as seen in the quoted text above. Hence the referred words do not speak of *Vishnu*. *Pradhaana* being referred to as *avyakta* suits well in view of a similar expression that says "*pradhaana* stays encircling *mahat*" indicating the superiority of *pradhaana* over *mahat*.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ "नामानि सर्वाणि यमाविशन्ति" (भाल्लवेय श्रुतिः) इत्यादिश्रुत्या विष्णोः अव्यक्तादिसर्वशब्दवाच्यत्वात् "अव्यक्तमचलं शान्तं" (पिप्प. श्रु.) "अनेन जीवेनात्मना" (छांदोग्यः ६-११-१) इत्यादिश्रौतस्मार्तप्रयोगात् । सूक्ष्मत्वेनाव्यक्तत्वस्य प्राणधारकत्वादेश्च अव्यक्तादिपदप्रवृत्तिनिमित्तस्य "यत्तत्सूक्ष्मं परमं वेदितव्यं" (पिप्प. श्रु.) इत्यादिना ईशे मुख्यत्वेन तेषां तत्र मुख्यत्वात् । महच्चमसशब्दयोः महत्तत्त्वयज्ञपात्रयोः प्रसिद्धत्वेऽपि "महान्तं विभुमात्मानं" (का. १-२-२२) "इदं तच्छिरः एष ह्यर्वाग्बिलश्चमसः" (बु. ४-२-३) इत्यादौ प्रवृत्तिनिमित्तमुख्यत्वादिना विष्णुशिरसोर्मुख्यत्वमिव अव्यक्तादिशब्दानां अन्यत्र प्रसिद्धत्वेऽपि ईशे मुख्यत्वेनोपपत्तेः तत्तच्छब्द-वाच्येशसम्बन्धादन्यत्र तत्तच्छब्दे व्यवहारस्याङ्गीकारेण अव्यवस्थानापत्तेः । "तमेवैकं जानथ आत्मानं अन्या वाचो विमुञ्चथ" इति (आथ. २-२-५) ईशस्यैव मुमुक्षुज्ञेयत्ववचनेन अन्यस्य तदवचनेन ईशज्ञान एव वेदस्य प्रवृत्तत्वात् अवरत्त्वदुःखादेः ईशेऽयोगेऽपि अन्यगतस्य ईशाधीनत्वेन स्वातन्त्र्येण निमित्तेन ईशे परावधित्ववाचिपञ्चम्यन्तपददुःख्यादिपदवाच्यत्वोपपत्तेः । सर्वस्मात्परे

महत्परत्वस्यापि सम्भवाच्च अव्यक्तादिशब्दमुख्यार्थो हरिरेवेति ॥ तदधीनत्वादिति सूत्राभिमतवर्णकन्तु शब्दपवृत्तिनिमित्तं च तद्वत्त्वमिव तत्प्रति स्वातन्त्र्यमपि शब्दप्रवृत्तौ हेतुरुत नेति संदेहे भृत्यगतबन्धादिकं प्रति सत्यपि स्वातन्त्र्ये राज्ञि बद्धादिशब्दाप्रयोगाच्चेति प्राप्ते भृत्यगतजयं प्रति स्वातन्त्र्येण राज्ञि जयशब्दप्रयोगात् बद्धादिपदाप्रयोगस्य च राज्ञो बन्धादियोग्यत्वेन अमङ्गलत्वरूपान्यहेतुकत्वेन स्वातन्त्र्यस्य अहेतुत्वानापादकत्वात् भवति स्वातन्त्र्यमपि शब्दवृत्तौ हेतुरिति । एवञ्च त्रिपाद्यां अन्तर्यामिनयादौ सिद्धेन सर्वनियन्तृत्वरूपस्वातन्त्र्यनिमित्तेन युक्ता हरौ बद्धादिशब्दवृत्तिरिति । तथा च स्मृतिः “सर्वस्य तदधीनत्वात् तत्तच्छब्दाभिधेयता” इत्यादिरिति । फलं तु समन्वयसूत्रोक्तसर्वशब्दसमन्वयाक्षेपः तत्समाधिश्च ॥ १ ॥

Based on the statement in *Bhaallaveya sruti* that says “all names speak of him” it can be understood that all the words like *avyakta* address *Vishnu*. There is usage as well in support of it as in the case of *Pippalaada* text of vedas that calls him “*avyaktam achalam shaantam*”, *Chandogya upanishat* that calls him *jeeva* in its expression “*anena jeevena aatmana*”. The words fit in *Vishnu* on account of their inherent meanings like “he is *avyakta*, incognigible on account of him being too small in size” and “he is *jeeva* since he enables the individuals to live”. The extreme size is described in *pippalaada sruti* as “*yat tat sookshmam paramam veditavyam*” thus showing that it is *Vishnu* who is primarily addressed by the said words.

Though the words *mahat* and *chamasa* are popular in *mahat-tatva* and the specific vessel used in *yajna*, they have been considered as primarily addressing *Vishnu* and the head respectively as indicated in *upanishats* such as “*mahaantam vibhum aatmaanam*” and “*idam tacchirah esha hi arvaagbilah chamasah*” and based on their inherent meanings. Similarly here, though the words like *avyakta* are popular in other objects, they speak of God in their primary sense. Others get those names because they are related to

those forms of God that have the respective names. This is also so for the purpose of dispensing worldly activities. In view of this arrangement, there is no possibility of a chaos on account of anything getting addressed by any name.

Mundakopanishat says “*tamaivekam jaanatha aatmaanam anyaa vaacho vimunchatha* – know only *aatma* and discard all other talks”. Since it is only God that needs to be known and not anything else, by a seeker, the entire of *vedas* are meant to describe God. Hence though the words meaning *avara* – inferior and *dukhi* – one with pain do not fit in God, they do fit in on account of God having the control over the inferiority and pain available in others. He is the master of pain and hence he is called *dukhi* the way one who owns *dhan* – money is called *dhani*. On the same count, even the inferiority fits in him as the one who causes the same in others. The expression that *avyakta* is superior to *mahat* also fits in God since he is superior to everyone and that includes *mahat* as well. Hence it is only *Hari*, who is addressed primarily by the words *avyakta* etc.

This chapter has one *sootra* “*tadadheenatvaat arthavat*” that says when the attributes are under the control of one person, he would be considered as the one possessing them. While applicability of the inherent meaning of a word is considered to mean possession of that quality, whether or not independence in controlling a particular object (or aspect) can be considered as a reason to address a person with that word is the doubt.

Though a king has freedom in the matter of jail term for his servant, never is it said that the king has been jailed when his servant is jailed. However, when the soldiers win a war, it is always said that the king won it. This being the case, it is seen that though the aspect of king’s imprisonment is a possibility, the

servants imprisonment is not termed as king's on account of it being a negative aspect. In the absence of a negativity, freedom in the matter becomes a reason for the assignment of servant's attribute to the master.

Thus, on account of the discussions in the earlier three sections, in the *sootra antaryaam-yadhi-daivaadishu* etc, leading to confirming the fact of *Hari* having the total control on everything independently, it is valid to say that the words like *baddha*, *dukhi* etc also speak of him. So says the script "Since everything is under his control, he is addressed by their respective names".

The benefit of this chapter lies in raising an objection on the contention of *sootra "tattu samanvayaat"* in stating that all words speak of God and its resolution.

॥ ॐ ज्योतिरुपक्रमात्तु तथाह्यधीयत एके ॐ ॥ २ ॥

Jyothirupakrmaattu tathaahi adheeyata eke - 2

॥ ॐ कल्पनोपदेशाच्च मध्वादिवदविरोधः ॐ ॥

kalpano-padeshaaccha madhwaadi-vadavirodhah

पूर्वत्र सिद्धरूपदेवतातत्क्रमवाचिनां "इन्द्रियेभ्यः" इत्यादीनां समन्वय उक्तः । अत्र तु साध्यरूपकर्मतत्क्रमवाचिनां स उच्यत इति पूर्वसङ्गतिः । "वसन्ते वसन्ते ज्योतिषा" इति वाक्ये श्रुतज्योतिरादिशब्दाः किं विष्णुवाचिनः किं वा तदन्यकर्मादिवाचिन इति सन्देहः । कर्मादिवाचिन इति पूर्वः पक्षः ॥ तेषां ज्योतिष्टोमादिकर्मादिष्वेव प्रसिद्धेः । प्रसिद्धित्यागेन ब्रह्मवाचित्वे च अन्यस्य कर्मतदङ्गक्रमदेवताकालाधिकार्यादिप्रापकस्याभावेन नियतकर्मानुष्ठानलोपः स्यात् । ज्योतिःपदवाच्येशसम्बन्धात् कर्मादावपि तेषां पूर्वत्रेव वृत्तिरित्यस्यापि ईशादन्यत्र लक्षणाप्रसङ्गेनायोगात् । किं चेशे तेषां रूढेशभावेन गुणपूर्यभावापातेन च योगस्यैव वाच्यत्वेन ततोऽपि कर्मणि रूढैर्बलवत्त्वात् ।

सर्वशब्दवाच्यत्वसिद्ध्यर्थं ज्योतिरादिपदावयवानामपि ब्रह्मपरत्वे समुदायस्य तत्परत्वायोगेन योगस्यासम्भवाच्चेति ॥

The aspects of existing things like deities and their gradation has been discussed in the previous chapter. This chapter deals with the achievable aspects of tasks and their gradation. Hence has the sequence of continuity with the previous one.

Whether the words like *jyothi*, as appearing in the sentences describing actions like “*vasante vasante jyotishaa yajeta – The jyothishtoma homa should be performed in every spring month*” speak of *Vishnu* or other things like the actions is the doubt.

The *poorvapaksha* says, the referred words speak of *karma*, the tasks etc. For, they are known to exist in the scripts speaking of actions like *jyothishtoma*. If we are to ignore the usage and consider them as speaking of *Brahma*, then there would be no words describing the tasks, their accessories, their sequence, their deities, the auspicious time, eligibility stipulations for them etc leading to non-performance of such prescribed tasks. If we are to say that the tasks etc are also addressed by the said words like *jyothi* on account of them being related to God having that name, it would mean a secondary treatment (*lakshana vritti*) and that is not proper. (This is like saying “the village is in Ganga”. The word Ganga here means its bank and not the waters. This treatment is called *lakshana vritti* and that is acceptable only when the primary meaning does not fit in and not out of fancy). This apart, there is no usage of the words like *jyothi* in *Vishnu*. Hence only the etymological meaning needs to be adopted to satisfy the quality of *gunapoorthi* – completeness of all qualities. The etymological meaning is weak vis-a-vis the usage. If we are to adopt the etymological meaning to satisfy the rule that all words speak of God, then on the same logic, even the components of each word

also would be speaking of God. When each component speaks of God, then the word as a whole would not be speaking of him. Hence we cannot adopt etymological meaning. Let us take the word *jyothishtoma* for understanding this aspect. The word is made of two components viz. *jyothi*h and *stoma*. If both words mean God, it would sound like GodGod and does not communicate anything.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ “तं यच्छतं वर्षाण्यभ्यार्चत् तस्माच्छतर्चिनस्तस्माच्छर्चिन इत्याचक्षत एतमेव सन्तम्” इत्यादिना (ऐ. २-२-१) उपलक्षणत्वेन केषाञ्चिच्छतर्च्यादिशब्दानां महायोगविद्वद्ब्रूढिभ्यां विष्णुपरत्वमुक्त्वा अन्ते “ता वा एतास्सर्वा ऋचः सर्वे वेदाः सर्वे घोषाः एकैव व्याहृतिः प्राण एवे”ति (ऐ.२.२-२) विष्णौ सर्वशब्दमुख्यार्थत्वोक्तेः मध्वादिशब्दस्य क्षौद्रकादौ रूढिमविहाय तदबाधेन “असौ वादित्यो देव मधु” (छां. ३-१-१) इत्यादौ महायोगवृत्त्या उपासनार्थं मध्वादिशब्दार्थस्योक्तिवत् ज्योतिरादिपदानां अन्यत्र रूढिवृत्तिमबाधित्वैव महायोगादिवृत्त्या ईशपरत्वाङ्गीकारेण कर्माद्यसिद्धयभावात् । तदवयवानामन्य-वाचित्वमुपेत्यैव समुदायस्य ईशपरत्वोपगमेन जातमोतं जगद्यस्माज्योतिरित्याद्युक्तयोगसम्भवात् ज्योतिरादिशब्दमुख्यार्थो हरिरेवेति । फलं तु पूर्ववदेव ॥ २ ॥

Aitareya upanishat indicates how the words are to be interpreted in favour of *Brahma* without diluting their meaning in usage. It says “*tam shatam varshaani abhyaarchat, tasmaat shatarchinah shatarchrinah ityaachaakshate* – Since he entered (*archni*) *Chaturmukha* for a hundred (*shatam*) years, he is called *shatarchi*”. This is just illustrative to show how all words speak of *Vishnu* by their *mahaayoga vritti* – the ultimate etymological sense. These words speak of *Vishnu* even by the usage of the learned people. The said *Upanishat* then proceeds to say “*taa vaa etaah sarve richa, sarve vedaah, sarve ghooshaah, ekaiva vyaahritih praana eva*” asserting that all the components of all the

vedic texts and even their sound speak of *Vishnu* (indicated by the word *praana*) in their primary sense. The words like “*madhu*” have their usage in objects like “honey”. Without discarding the said meaning, the words are used in *madhu vidya* etc to denote God in their ultimate primary sense (*maha-yoga-vritti*) as “*asou vaa aadityo deva madhu*” to facilitate *upaasana*. Similarly, the words *jyothi* etc mean God in their ultimate primary sense without discarding their usage in other aspects. Hence there is no hurdle in understanding the *karma* aspects through such words. As regards the objection relating the components speaking of God, there is no trouble there. The meaning of components is taken to derive the meaning of the whole as *Vishnu*. The word *jyothi* thus means “the one in whom the entire of universe that is born, is stationed” (*jaatam otam yasmin asou – jyothih*). Hence it is *Hari* who is the one addressed primarily by the words like *jyothih*.

The benefit of this chapter is similar to that of the previous chapter.

॥ ॐ न संख्योपसंग्रहादपि नानाभावादतिरेकाच्च ॐ ॥ ३ ॥

na sankhyopa-sangrahaad-api naanaa-bhaavaad-atirekaaccha - 3
॥ ॐ प्राणादयो वाक्यशेषात् ॐ ॥ ॥ॐ ज्योतिषेकेषामसत्यन्ने ॐ ॥
praanaadayo vaakyasheShaata; jyotishekeshaamasatyanne;

पूर्वत्र प्रसिद्धस्य ज्योतिरादिशब्दनिमित्तस्याभावेऽपि योगलभ्यं अप्रसिद्धं तदस्तीत्युक्तम् ॥ इह तु पञ्चजनादिशब्दानां प्रसिद्धमेव तदीशेऽस्तीत्युच्यत इति सङ्गतिः । काण्वश्रुतौ षष्ठेऽध्याये “तद्वेवा ज्योतिषां ज्योतिरायुर्होपासतेऽमृतम् । यस्मिन् पञ्च पञ्चजनाः आकाशश्च प्रतिष्ठितः ॥ तमेव मन्य आत्मानं विद्वान् ब्रह्मामृतोऽमृतम्” (बृ. ६-४-१६, १७) इति श्रुतपञ्चत्वयुक्तः पञ्चजनादिशब्द-मुख्यार्थः किं वाक्यशेषे षष्ठ्यन्तेन प्राणचक्षुःश्रोत्रमनोऽन्नादिशब्देनोक्ता किं वा द्वितीयान्ततत्तच्छब्दनिर्दिष्टेश्चस्वरूपाणीति सन्देहः । विष्णवन्धे प्राणादय एव पञ्चजनादिशब्दार्थः इति पूर्वः पक्षः । तस्य बहुत्वविशिष्टार्थवाचित्वात् । तस्य

चैकमेवाद्वितीयमित्युक्तिविरोधेन ईशेऽयोगात् । वशीकृतबहुजनेऽपि राजनि बहुत्ववाचिशब्दादर्शनेन तदधीनत्वन्यायस्यापि अत्र अनवतारात् । गुहामित्यत्र गुहानिविष्टत्वादिबाधकेन एकस्यानेकत्वं नेत्युत्सर्गबाधेऽपि इह बाधकाभावेन तन्न्यायस्याप्यनवकाशात् । तमेवात्मानमित्यात्मपदसामानाधिकरण्यात् । यस्मिन्नित्यस्य ब्रह्मत्वेन तदाश्रितानां पञ्चानां जनानां आकाशस्य ब्रह्मत्वे एकस्याधाराधेयभावानुपपत्तेश्चेति ॥

In the previous chapter, it is described that though the popular usage of the words like *jyothi* is not available to point at *Vishnu*, the not so popular etymological meaning has been shown to address him. This chapter shows how even the popular meaning of the words associated with numbers like *panchajana* would fit in *Vishnu*. Hence it has the sequence of continuance with the previous chapter.

In *Brihadaranyaka upanishat*, we find a description “*taddevaa jyothishaam jyothih aayurhopaasate amritam, yasmin pancha pancha janaah aakaashascha pratishtitah, tamea manye aatmaanam vidvaan brahma amrito amritam*”. The expression “*pancha pancha janaah*” here speaks of persons qualified by the numeral five – Five persons. Whether this expression “Five persons” speaks of “*praana, chakshu, shrotram, manah, anna*” who are indicated as reference points (with suffix *sya*) in the next sentence as “*praanasya praanam*” etc or God who is described as the subject in *dviteeya vibhakti* (with suffix “*m*” etc”) is the question. The *poorvapaksha* says that these expressions speak of others like *praana* who are different from *Vishnu*. For the expression speaks of plurality. God is described as “*ekameva advitiyam* – He is one and the only with no second” and hence plurality does not fit in him. We cannot even consider him as plural on account of the referred five being under his control. Though there are many servants, a king is not addressed in plural. Though

earlier plurality is considered in *sootra* “*guham pravishtou aatmaanou..*”, that was an exception because of a hurdle in considering the attribute “*guhapravishtatva*” for counting others. There is no such constraint here to have an exception for the rule that “single cannot have plurality”. The one in whom the five persons are present is referred to by the name *aatma*, meaning *Brahma*. If other names like *praana* also speak of *Brahma*, it would mean like the same person is the container and the content, which is illogical.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ “प्राणस्य प्राणं चक्षुषश्चक्षुः श्रोत्रस्य श्रोत्रं अन्नस्यानं मनसो मनः” इति वाक्यशेषे द्वितीयान्ततया श्रुतानां प्राणादिनियन्तृत्वादिविष्णु-लिङ्गस्य श्रवणेन विष्णुरूपत्वात् तेषां च षष्ठ्यन्तनिर्दिष्टप्राणाद्यपेक्षया शब्दतोऽर्थतश्च प्राधान्यात् । “नामानि सर्वाणि” “तावा एता” इत्याद्युक्तसर्व-शब्दवाच्यत्वमुमुक्षुज्ञेयत्वादिप्रागुक्तहेतुभ्यश्च एकस्यापि बहुरूपत्वेन पञ्चत्व-सङ्ख्यायाः भेदप्रतिनिधिविशेषबलेन यस्मिन्निति निर्दिष्टशरीरस्वरूपस्य पञ्चजनादिशब्दितरूपाणां च आधाराधेयभावस्यापि सम्भवात् । माध्यन्दिन-शाखायामिव काण्वश्रुतौ वाक्यशेषे अन्नाख्यरूपस्याश्रवणेऽपि पूर्वश्रुतज्योतिषा सह पञ्चत्वात् वाक्यशेषस्थद्वितीयान्तप्राणादिशब्दितेशरूपविशेषा एव पञ्चजना इति ॥ अत्र पादे सर्वत्र पूर्ववदेव फलम् ॥ ३ ॥

In the sentence subsequent to the one in discussion, *Upanishat* says “*praanasya praanam, chakshushah chakshuh, srotrasya srotram, annasya annam, manaso manah*”. The later ones in the above pairs that are in *dviteeya vibhakti* (*praanam, chakshuh, srotram* etc) are the attributes of *Vishnu*. (the *upanishat* says “he is the *praana* of *praana*, eye of eye, ear of ear, food of food and mind of mind” indicating that he is the one who is providing all the things their respective capabilities. This quality is specific to *Vishnu*). Hence all the five referred individuals are the forms of *Vishnu*. These forms are the primary ones, addressed by the words both by their

expression and by their meaning, vis-a-vis those addressed by the former words of the pairs referred to above shown in their *Shashti vibhakti* (*praanasya, chakshushah, srotrasya* etc). Even the vedic texts referred to earlier like “*naamaani sarvaani*”, “*taavaa etaa*” that say that all words speak of *Vishnu* also stand in support. Though *Vishnu* is one, the plurality fits in him on account of him having many forms. These forms are no different from him but are transacted as different on account of *vishesha* and for the same reason, one staying in another also fits in though such one and the another are one and the same. Thus it is quite logical to say that the forms named by the word “*panchajana*” are staying in the one specified as staying in the physical body.

Though “*anna*” as quoted above from the *kanvasruti* is not found in *maadhyandinaayana sruti*, the count of five gets satisfied by including *gyothi* referred to in the previous sentence. Thus those depicted by the words *praana* etc in *dviteeya vibhakti* are none other than the five forms of God.

In this section, the benefit of all chapters is similar to the one indicated in the previous chapter.

॥ ॐ कारणत्वेन च आकाशादिषु यथाव्यपदिष्टोक्तेः ॐ ॥ ४ ॥

Kaaranatvena cha aakaashaadishu yathaa vyapadishtokteh – 4

अत्र कालस्सदास्तीत्यादौ दर्शनादेकस्याधाराधेयभावसम्भवेऽपि कार्यकारण-
भावस्य क्वाप्यदर्शनादयुक्तः स इति पूर्ववैषम्येण शङ्कनात्सङ्गतिः । तैत्तिरीये
ब्रह्मवल्ल्यां “आत्मन आकारस्सम्भूतः आकाशाद्वायुः” (तै. २-३)
इत्यादिवाक्ये कार्यत्वेन कारणत्वेन च श्रुताकाशादिशब्दाः किं मुख्यतो
विष्णुवाचका उत भूतादिवाचका इति सन्देहः । पूर्वपक्षस्तु ॥ “न जायते म्रियते”
(का. १-२-१७) इत्यादेः अकार्ये ब्रह्मणि कार्यत्वविरोधेन स्वकार्यत्वस्य
सुतरां विरुद्धत्वात् व्यङ्ग्यव्यञ्जकभावरूपस्यापि कार्यकारणभावस्य एकस्मिन्

विरोधात् । सुतजनेः जनकाधीनत्वेऽपि तत्र जातपदादर्शनेन तदधीनन्यायस्या-
प्यत्रानवतारात् । नामानि सर्वाणीति श्रुतेरपि सङ्गोचावश्यंभावात्
आकाशादिजन्मासिद्ध्यापाताच्च आकाशादिशब्दाः अन्यवाचका एवेति ॥

Though one staying in oneself is possible as in the case of “time always exists”, a thing being its own cause is not seen anywhere. Hence such an expression is not valid. This chapter is based on the said invalidity and hence has a different doubt from the earlier one.

In the *brahma valli* of *taittiriya upanishat*, there is a description that says “*aatmana aakaashah sambhootah aakaashaad vaayuh – aakaasha* takes birth from *aatma* and *vaayu* takes birth from *aakaasha*” etc. The word *aakasha* is described here as the one that is a cause of something and an effect of something else. Whether this word “*aakasha*” speaks of *Vishnu* or the physical sky etc is the doubt.

Poorvapaksha – *Vishnu* cannot be an effect (result) of anything. For, he is described as “*na jaayate na mriyate* – he is neither born nor does he die”. This being so, it is absurd to consider him to be his own creator. The cause-effect aspect can be construed not just in the case of a creator and the created but also in the case of the one that facilitates manifestation and the manifested, as in the case of common salt causing the manifestation of the taste in soup. Even if this meaning is adopted, it does not fit in the case of *aakaasha* since the manifester and the manifested cannot be one and the same. Can it be that the name of one who is under one’s control is used for the master as in the case of the deities like *agni* who get the names of *agni*, the fire? No, in the case of one taking birth from another, such an usage is not possible. The name *shooraja* can be there for the son of *shoora* but not for *shoora* himself. The rule “*naamaani sarvaani..*” that all names address

Vishnu needs to be limited to exclude the words like *aakaasha* and that such words need to be considered as speaking others only as otherwise the very birth of *aakaasha* becomes unauthentic.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ विष्णोरेवाकाशादिनियामकरूपाणां “य आकाशे तिष्ठन्” (बृ. ५-७-१२) इत्यादिश्रुत्या आकाशादिस्थानां बहुत्वेन व्यक्त्यव्यक्त्यपेक्षया पौर्वापर्ययोगेन वाय्वाद्युत्पत्तौ तत्स्थरूपस्य व्यक्त्या, व्यङ्ग्यव्यञ्जकभावरूप-कार्यकारणभावस्य सम्भवात् । बाधकाभावेन नामानीत्यादिश्रुतेः सङ्कोचायोगेन प्रागुक्तसाधकानां सत्त्वात् । ज्योतिर्नयोक्तरीत्या अन्यत्र रुढेरभ्युपगतत्वेन आकाशाद्युत्पत्त्यसिद्ध्यभावाच्च आकाशादिशब्दमुख्यार्थो हरिरेवेति ॥ ४ ॥

It is only the forms of *Vishnu*, that regulate *aakaasha* etc, that are called by such names. The fact of such control is made clear in *Brihadaraanyaka upanishat* that says “*ya aakaashe tishtan..* - one who stays in *aakaasha*, who is unknown to *aakaasha..* and regulates *aakaasha*” etc. As regards the cause-effect concept it is not in the sense of creator and created but in the sense of manifest and manifested. As and when the objects like *vaayu* are created, the forms of *Vishnu* staying in and regulating such things get manifested. Since there is no hurdle in applying the rule “*naamaani sarvaani*”, there is no need to find an exception here. Thus since there is no hurdle, there are supporting aspects in support of treating the words like *aakaasha* as speaking of *Vishnu*, as clarified in the *sootra* “*jyotirupakramaat..*”, the names can primarily address *Vishnu* without impacting their usage in other objects and there is no hurdle in describing the creation of *aakaasha* etc, the one primarily addressed by the words *aakaasha* is *Vishnu* alone.

॥ ॐ समाकर्षात् ॐ ॥ ५ ॥

Samaakarshaat - 5

॥ ॐ जगद्वाचित्वात् ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ जीवमुख्यप्राणलिङ्गादितिचेत्तद्व्याख्यातम् ॐ
 ॥ ॥ ॐ अन्यार्थं तु जैमिनिः प्रश्नव्याख्यानाभ्यामपि चैवमेके ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ
 वाक्यान्वयात् ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ प्रतिज्ञासिद्धेर्लिङ्गमाश्रयः ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ
 उत्क्रमिष्यत एवं भावादित्यौदुलोमिः ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ अवस्थितेरिति काशकृत्स्नः
 ॐ ॥

*jagadvaachitvaat; jeeva-mukhya-praana-lingaaditi-chet-tadvyaakhaatam;
 anyartham tu jaiminih prashna-vyaakhyaanaabhyam-api chavimeke;
 vaakyaanvayaat; pratijnaasiddher-lingamaashmarathyah; utkramishyata
 evam bhaavaadityaudulomih; avasthiteriti kaashakritsnah;*

अत्र आकाशादिशब्दानां अन्यत्रापि रूढ्यङ्गीकृतौ ईशे तदन्यत्र च
 अक्षादिशब्दवत्तुल्या मुख्यवृत्तिः स्यादिति शङ्कनात्सङ्गतिः । सर्वशब्दानां ईशे
 तदन्यत्र च उक्ता मुख्यता किं तुल्या किं वा ईशे अधिका अन्यत्र तु हीनेति
 सन्देहः ॥ पूर्वपक्षस्तु ॥ अक्षादिशब्दानां अनेकार्थवाचिनां अनेकत्रैव
 सर्वशब्दानामीशे तदन्यत्र च मुख्यत्वं तुल्यमेव स्यात् । अन्यथा अन्यत्र हीनत्वे
 लक्षणेत्यस्यैव मुख्यवृत्तिरिति परिभाषा स्यात् । ईशे मुख्यत्वस्याधिक्ये तत्रैव
 प्रसिद्ध्यापातेन जगति प्रसिद्धिर्न स्यात् । ईशज्ञानादेव पुरुषार्थसिद्ध्या
 कर्मदेवतादौ शब्दानां हीनवृत्त्यापि व्यवहारस्य फलान्तरानिच्छुं मुमुक्षुं प्रति
 व्यर्थत्वापाताच्च । किञ्च शब्दवृत्तिहेतोः ईशगतत्वापेक्षया तत्राधिक्यमिति न
 युक्तम् । अन्यत्रापि सत्त्वात् । नापि तदधीनत्वन्यायेन "अस्य यदेकां शाखां
 जीवो जहात्यथ सा शुष्यति" इति (छां. ६-११-२) क्वचिज्जीवाधीनत्वस्य
 "वायुना हि सर्वे लोका नेनीयन्ते" इति सर्वस्य वाय्वधीनत्वप्रतीत्या तयोरपि
 ईशवन्मुख्यवाच्यत्वापातादिति ॥

This chapter begins with a question "If the usage of the words *aakaasha* etc are considered as valid while stating that those words address *Vishnu*, then those words should be considered as primarily addressing such other things on par with *Vishnu*, the way it is so in the case of word *aksha*". Hence this chapter has the sequence of objection with the previous chapter.

Whether the primariness in addressing *Vishnu* and others by the words is on par for both or that it is higher in *Vishnu* and lower in others is the question.

Poorvapaksha – We find that the words like “*aksha*” address many objects on par primarily. The word speaks of “*aksha* – the dice”, “*akshaamsha* – the latitude”, “*pratyaksha* – the sensory knowledge” all in their primary sense and on par. It should be similar in the case of words addressing *Vishnu* and others also in their primary sense. If this is not so and considered as addressing others in lower sense it would then mean *mukhyavritti* (primary sense) to be *lakshana vritti* (secondary sense). If the primariness is higher in God, the usage also should be with him and not with the worldly aspects. Since it is only knowledge of God that leads to *moksha*, the words addressing the deities or describing the tasks and so on, though in lower primariness, are of no use for the seeker who does not have a desire for anything else. This apart, it is not proper to say that since the reason for using a word is with God (as the one having the quality described by the said word) the primariness is higher in him. Such a quality lies in others as well. It is not even on the count that the things described by such words are under his own control. *Chandogya upanishat* says “when *jeeva* leaves a particular branch (of the tree), that branch dries out” indicating that the control lies with *jeeva*. Another script says “all the worlds are driven by *Vaayu*” thus indicating that everything is under the control of *Vaayu*. Hence both *jeeva* and *Vaayu* should be considered as primary addresses like God.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ ब्रह्मणि अन्यतोऽधिकैव शब्दानां मुख्यता, अन्यत्र हीनैव
रुदियोगयोरिव गौणलक्षणयोरिव, ईशे अन्यत्र च रुदिसत्त्वेऽपि
विद्वदविद्वद्भूदिभ्यां यौगिकत्वेऽपि योगमहायोगाभ्यां तारतम्यसम्भवेन
महायोगविद्वद्भूदिभ्यां परममुख्यवृत्त्या विष्णुनिष्ठानामेव तेषां अन्यत्र ततः

समाकृष्य मुख्यवृत्त्या व्यवहारात् । बालानां चित्रलिखितसिंहादाविव लोकानामन्यत्रैव शब्दव्यवहारेण अन्यत्रप्रसिद्धयुपपत्तेः । कर्मदेवताधारत्वादिना ईशज्ञानार्थमेव कर्मादौ वेदव्यवहारस्य सम्भवात् । जीवादौ श्रुतस्वातन्त्र्यस्य च तदन्तर्यामिगतत्वेन पादान्त्यप्राणनये सिद्धत्वादिति ॥ फलं तु विष्णुरेव सर्वशब्दमुख्यार्थः इति समन्वयसूत्रोक्तावधारणाक्षेपः तत्समाधिश्चेति ॥ ५ ॥

The primariness in address of all words is higher in *Brahma vis-a-vis* in others. In others it is lower in its intensity. This is similar to the treatment of “usage-inherent meaning” and “*gouna-lakshana*” ways of expressions. Though there is usage in God and others, there is a difference by virtue of them being “*vidwadroodhi-ajnaroodhi* (usage of the learned and usage of the common man). Similarly, though there is *yoga* (availability of quality described by the word) of the words in God and others there is a difference in being “*mahayoga* and *yoga*”. Thus the words speak of *Vishnu* in the ultra-primary sense through *vidwadroodhi* and *mahaayoga*. While being so, the words are applied in others in their *mukhyavritti* – primary sense. The way children call the picture of a lion as lion, the common men use the words in addressing others only and hence their usage in others. The usage of words in others in *karma*, deity etc in *veda* is meant to enable knowledge of God. The independence of *jeeva* etc in the quoted texts belongs to God who stays in them as energizer and regulator as has been explained in the chapter “*praanas-tatha-anugamaat*” (1-1-12).

The benefit of this chapter is in raising an objection on the decision that all words speak of *Vishnu* in their primary sense as explained in the *sootra* “*tattu samanvayaat*” and its resolution.

॥ ॐ प्रकृतिश्च प्रतिज्ञादृष्टान्तानुपरोधात् ॐ ॥ ६ ॥

Prakritishcha pratijnaa-drishtaanta-anuparodhaat - 6

॥ ॐ अभिध्योपदेशाच्च ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ साक्षाच्चोभयाम्नानात् ॐ ॥

॥ ॐ आत्मकृतेः परिणामात् ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ योनिश्च हि गीयते ॐ ॥

abhidhyo-padeshaac-cha; saakshaaccho-bhaya-amnaanaat; aatmakriteh parinaamaat; yonishcha hi geeyate;

अत्र सर्वशब्दानां विष्णावधिका वृत्तिः अन्यत्र हीनेति प्रागुक्तमयुक्तम् । स्त्रीलिङ्गशब्दानां मुख्यवृत्तेरेवायोगात् कुतः आधिक्यचिन्तेति शङ्कनात् सङ्गतिः । “एषा ह्येव प्रकृतिरविकृतिः” (वत्सश्रुतिः) इत्यादिवाक्योक्तस्त्रीलिङ्गप्रकृत्यादि-शब्दाः किं विष्णुवाचिनोऽन्यवाचिनो वेति सन्देहः । अन्यवाचिन इति पूर्वः पक्षः । तेषां अन्यत्रैव प्रसिद्धत्वात् स्त्रीलिङ्गत्वाच्च । परमपुरुषे स्त्रीत्वाभावात् । “नैनं वाचा स्त्रियं ब्रुवन्” इति स्त्रीत्वनिषेधेन रूपविशेषेण स्त्रीत्वमित्यस्याप्ययोगात् । ब्रह्मादिनपुंसकशब्दस्य कलत्रादिशब्देष्विव शब्दसाधुत्वमात्रेण युक्तत्वेऽपि इह न तथा, कल्पकाभावात् । नामानि सर्वाणीत्यस्य सङ्कोचसम्भवात् । वशीकृतभार्येऽपि भार्यापदप्रयोगादर्शनेन अन्यगतस्त्रीत्वस्येशाधीनत्वमुपेत्य तदधीनत्वन्यायेन ईशे तच्छब्दवृत्तिरित्यस्याप्ययोगादिति ॥

The conclusion that all the primariness of words is higher in addressing *Vishnu* and lower for others is incorrect. For, the words in feminine gender cannot speak of *Vishnu* in their primary sense. When the primariness itself is not possible, where is the question of it being higher. This chapter that begins with this doubt has the sequence of objection with the previous one.

Whether the words like *prakriti* as they appear in the statements like “*eshaa hyeva prakritih avikritih*” etc, that are in feminine gender address *Vishnu* or others is the doubt. *Poorvapaksha* says, they speak of others. For, they are known to address others only and they are in feminine gender. Femininity does not fit in *paramapurusha* – the supreme-man. Since the scripts (*nainam vaachaa striyam bruvan* – vedas do not say that he is a woman) negate a femininity in God, it is not possible to consider that God is a women even in one of its forms. Though the words like

“*Brahma*” that speak of God are in neutral gender, it is only because the words are like that, as in the case of *kalatram* that means wife. It is not so here – there is no evidence to consider them as such. These words can be considered as an exception to the rule that all words speak of God. The rule of *antaryaami* (one controlling a thing gets addressed by the name of such thing) cannot be applied and said that since he has the control of *prakriti* etc, he is called by such names. Just because some one has controlled his wife, he would not be called “wife”.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ “हन्तैतमेव पुरुषं सर्वाणि नामान्यभिवदन्ती”त्यादिश्रुतौ (वत्सश्रुतिः) सामान्यतोऽशेषशब्दवाच्यत्वं ईशस्योक्त्वा नदीसमुद्रदृष्टान्तेन तदुपपादनात् । “मायां तु प्रकृतिं विद्यात्” (श्वे. उ. ४-१०) “प्रकृतिर्वासनेत्येवं तवेच्छानन्त कथ्यते” इत्यादिश्रुतिस्मृतिषु इच्छायाः प्रकृतिपदवाच्यत्वात् तस्याश्च “सोऽभिध्या स जूतिः” (पैङ्गिश्रुतिः) इत्यादिश्रुतौ ईशस्वरूपत्वोक्तेः, एष स्त्री एष पुरुषः एष प्रकृतिरिति साक्षात् प्रकृतिपुरुषशब्दवाच्यत्वाम्नानात् । प्रकृतिं प्रविश्य तां महदाद्यात्मना परिणाम्य तन्नियामकतया आत्मनो बहुधाकरणेन प्रकृष्टाकृतिः यस्येति योगसम्भवात् अव्यवधानेन सूतिहेतुत्वरूपस्त्रीत्वस्य यद्भूतयोनिमिति श्रुतौ योनिशब्देन गानात् प्रकृत्यादिसर्वस्त्रीलिङ्गशब्दमुख्यार्थो हरिरेवेति ॥ ६ ॥

Vatsa sruti says “*hanta etameva purusham sarvaani naamaani abhivadanti* – it is a surprise that all names speak of this person alone” and illustrates it with the rivers culminating in the sea. Thus, generically, it is confirmed that all names speak of *Vishnu*. *Swetashvatara upanishat* says “know that *maya* is *prakriti*” and another script says “O! Ananta, your desire is called *prakriti* and *vaasana*”. Thus, God’s desire is called *prakriti*. As narrated in *paingee sruti* (so *abhidhyaa sa jootih*”, he is himself his desire). Thus, it is valid to say he is addressed by the word *prakriti*. The same *paingee sruti* says “*esha stree esha purushah esha prakritih..*” thus directly stating that God is addressed as *prakriti*

and *purusha*. The etymological meaning of *prakriti* is as follows – He enters *prakriti*, modifies it into *mahat* etc and through his own multiple forms regulates all such things. Thus he is the one who possesses *prakrishta aakriti* (many forms). Hence he is called *prakriti*.

After all, who is a woman? The one who causes birth of a child directly. *Vishnu* also does this. *Sruti* says him to be “*bhootayoni* – the one who causes birth of *jeevas*”. Hence he is *stree* – woman. Hence it stands confirmed that *Hari* is addressed in their primary sense by all words like *prakriti* etc that are in feminine gender.

॥ ॐ एतेन सर्वे व्याख्याता व्याख्याताः ॐ ॥ ७ ॥

etena sarve vyaakhyaataa vyaakhyaataah - 7

अत्र पूर्ववैषम्येण पूर्वपक्षोत्थानात्सङ्गतिः । “असद्वा इदमग्र आसीदित्यादौ श्रुतासच्छून्यादिशब्दाः किं ईशवाचिनोऽन्यवाचिनो वेति सन्देहः । पूर्वपक्षस्तु युक्तं पूर्वोक्तं रूपं स्त्रीत्वं रूपाहानेः न तु निषेध्यत्वादिरूपं असदादिशब्दवृत्ति-निमित्तं, रूपहानेः । असतो निःस्वरूपस्य नियमनाभावेन तस्य ईशाधीनत्वायोगेन तदधीनन्यायस्याप्यनवतारात् । अतोऽसदादिशब्दा अन्यवाचिनः इति ॥

Since *poorvapaksha* of this chapter begins with a difference from that of the previous, it has the sequence with the earlier one.

Whether the words like *asat*, *shoonya* as are found in the vedic texts like “*asadvaa idamagra aaseet*” etc speak of God or others is the question. *Poorvapaksha* says, though it is proper to accept femininity to God as it does not demean his nature, the words like *asat* that are in the form of negation cannot be treated as such. Considering such words to mean God would amount to demeaning

him. The other possibility of considering him to be addressed by such words on account of him having the total control is also not there. What control can be there on *asat* - a thing that does not exist? Hence the words like *asat* speak of others and not God.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ प्रसिद्धशून्यत्वादेः ईशगतत्वाभावेऽपि "शमूनं कुरुते" इत्यादिस्मृत्युक्तयोगसम्भवात् असतोऽप्यसत्त्वादिना नियमनसम्भवेन तदधीन-त्वाद्युक्तसाधकेन च असच्छून्यादिशब्दमुख्यार्थो हरिरेवेति ॥ फलं तूक्तमेव ॥

Though it is true that the words like *shoonya* with their known meanings do not fit in God, their etymological meaning as stated in *smritis* do fit in him. The word *shoonya* means "*sham oonam kurute* - one who reduces the pleasure (of demons)". A thing is *asat* - non-existent because God has desired it to be so. The cat does not have horns because God has desired not to provide them to cats. Thus, non-existence is also under the control of God. Hence it is only *Hari* who is addressed by the words like *asat*, *shoonya* etc in their primary sense.

॥ इति श्रीराधवेन्द्रयतिकृतायां न्यायमुक्तावल्यां आद्येऽध्याये चतुर्थः पादः ॥

॥ प्रथमाध्यायः समाप्तः ॥

अथ द्वितीयाध्यायः

द्वितीयाध्याये प्रथमः पादः

॥ हरिः ॐ ॥ पूर्वोक्तसमन्वयस्य स्थेम्ने अत्र विरोधनिरासात् पूर्वाध्यायेनास्य हेतुहेतुमद्भावसङ्गतिः । युक्ति-समय-श्रुति-युक्तियुक्तश्रुतिविरोधानां पत्यादिभङ्गे अश्वादिवत्प्रवर्तमानानां क्रमेण पादचतुष्टयेन निरासः क्रियते । चतूरूपत्वात् आद्यनये स्मृतिविरोधो निरस्यते ॥

In the previous division it has been proved that all words speak of Vishnu alone in their primary sense. Now in this division, the said fact is reiterated by removal of apparent contradictions for the same. The contradictions are basically from logical deductions, other philosophies, Vedic texts and from vedic texts that are supported by yukti, logic.

॥ ॐ स्मृत्यनवकाशदोषप्रसङ्ग इति चेन्नान्यस्मृत्यनवकाशदोषप्रसङ्गात् ॐ ॥ १ ॥

Smrit-yanavakaasha-dosha-prasanga iti chenna-anya-smrit-yanavakaasha-dosha-prasangaat – 1

॥ ॐ इतरेषां चानुपलब्धेः ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ एतेन योगः प्रत्युक्तः ॐ ॥

itareshaam cha-anupalabdheh; etena yogah pratyuktah;

प्राक् श्रुतिसमन्वयेनोक्तं विष्णोर्विश्वकर्तृत्वं युक्तं न वेति सन्देहः । न युक्तमिति पूर्वः पक्षः । शिवादिकर्तृत्वबोधकशैवसाङ्ख्यकापिलादिसर्वश्रौतस्मृतिविरोधात् । तासां च सर्वज्ञत्वादिना प्रसिद्धशिवाद्याप्तप्रणीतत्वेन आप्तिरूपगुणयुक्तत्वेन प्राबल्यात् । श्रुतेश्च अपौरुषेयत्वेन निर्मूलतया दौर्बल्यात् । काणादादिमते श्रुतेराप्तोक्तत्वेन समूलकत्वेऽपि तत्स्मृतीनां विस्पष्टार्थत्वसयुक्तिकत्वाभ्यां प्राबल्यात्तुल्यबलत्वाभावेन विरुद्धत्वेन च वस्तुनि विकल्पस्य दुर्बलत्वे श्रुत्या बाधस्यायोगात् देशादिभेदेन अविरोधस्य च श्रुत्यादौ तत्र तत्र तस्य तस्य सर्वकर्तृत्वोक्त्या युक्तत्वात् “विरोधे त्वनपेक्ष”मिति (प. मी.) पूर्वतन्त्रस्य विरोधनये स्मृतीनां श्रुतिमूलत्वेन प्रामाण्यमिति पक्ष एव श्रुतिविरोधेन तासां

बाधोक्तेः इह तु स्मृतीनां शिवादिप्रत्यक्षमूलत्वेन वैषम्यात् । अतः तत्तत्समृत्य-
नुरोधेन शिवादिकर्तृत्व एव श्रुतीनां नेयत्वात् बौद्धार्हतादिस्मृतिविरोधेन
अप्रामाण्याद्वा इति ॥

A suspicion is raised on the propriety of *samanvaya* of vedic words done in the previous division in the matter of *Vishnu* being the creator of the universe. The *poorvapaksha* says that he is not, for this contradicts several authored (*smritis*) and unauthored (*vedic*) texts that propound others like *siva* as the creators of this universe. The said *smritis* are written by *Siva* and others who are well known to be omniscients. Thus these texts have the advantage of being *aapti moola* – written by a knowledgeable person. *Veda* however does not have this advantage since it is not written by anyone. Thus *smritis* stand stronger vis-a-vis *Vedas*. In the opinion of *Kaanaada* (founder of *vaisheshika* theory) and others, *Vedas* are also considered as authored texts (*pourusheya*). In spite of that, they are weak for the reason that their presentation of subject is unclear and scattered while that of *smritis* is clear and unambiguous.

Smritis are many in number and with each one projecting some or the other deity as the creator of the universe, they stand opposing each other. This conflict can be resolved by interpreting them to refer a particular time zone and / or place. While what one *smriti* says is with reference to a particular *yuga*, *manvantara* etc., the other refers to some other *yuga*, *manvantara* etc. Thus where one *smriti* says that *Siva* is the creator and another says it is *Paarvati* and the third projects *Soorya*, all of them are true since they are referring to different periods. This resolution of conflict can also be done by referring to different geographic locations instead of time windows.

Thus, the conclusion arrived in the previous division through *samanvaya* of *Vedas* that *Vishnu* alone is the creator etc stands negated.

There is one rule in *poorva meemamsa* that says since *smritis* have their origin based on *Vedas*, if some *smriti* contradicts *Vedas*, that part of the *smriti* be ignored (*virodhe tu anapeksham*). This rule however is not applicable in the present case, since *smritis* are not counted as offshoots of *Veda* but as independent of it and based on the physical perception of the omniscient writer.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ पञ्चरात्रादिस्मृतीनां सर्वज्ञतमविष्णवादि प्रणीतत्वेन श्रुत्युक्तसंवादेन, तत्सहायेन विस्पष्टार्थवादित्वेन च बलवत्तया तद्वाधितत्वात् शैवादिस्मृत्युक्तसाधनानुष्ठानेऽपि तत्फलत्वेनोक्तस्य प्रत्यक्षयोग्यस्यानुपलब्ध्या फलविसंवादात् आप्तोक्तत्वस्याप्यभावेन अवैदिकस्मृतीनामप्रामाण्यात् श्रुतिसमन्वयेनोक्तं विष्णोर्विश्वकर्तृत्वं युक्तमिति । समन्वयसूत्रे उपक्रमादिभिरेव वेदार्थो निर्णय इत्युक्तावपि अत्र तेऽपि तदनुरोधेन नेया इति शङ्कनात्पुनरारम्भः । शास्त्रयोनिनये, दृष्टफलेषु प्रामाण्यं अपस्मृतीनामुपेत्य तत्रैव विश्वकारणत्वेऽप्यस्तु प्रामाण्यमिति प्राप्ते "नावेदवित्" इत्यादिना तत्र न मानत्वमित्युक्तम् । अत्र तु प्रत्यक्षफल एव विसंवादात् अप्रामाण्यमुच्यत इति तेनास्य अगतार्थत्वमिति ध्येयम् । फलं तु अत्राध्याये सर्वत्र जन्मादिसूत्रोक्तविश्वकर्तृत्वाक्षेपः तत्समाधिश्चेति ॥ १ ॥

If the authenticity of (*praamaanyam*) of *vedas* are to be suspected for the reason that its contents contradict those of *smritis* like *Paashupataagama*, then for the reason, the referred *smritis* are to be treated as *apramaana* (unauthentic) since their contents contradict the contents of other *smritis* like *pancharaatraagama* that are written by absolute omniscients like *Vishnu*. It cannot even be said that the *smritis* like *Paashupata-agama* and *Pancha-raatra-agama* stand on equal footing and that they can only cause a doubt, for that reason, but not a conclusion on the unauthenticity of any one. *Pancha-raatra-agama* is more powerful than the others for the following reasons:

1. This is written by *Vishnu* who is considered as more knowledgeable than the authors of *Paasupaata-agama* etc.
2. *Pancha-raatra-agama* has the backing of *Vedas* – in the sense, the contents of this book have supportive texts in *Vedas*.

Thus authenticity of *Vedas* cannot be questioned just because some or the other *smriti* contradicts them.

Though the contents of *Vedas* are difficult to understand for the reasons of them being unclear and scattered in nature, their meanings are clear and unambiguous when read in conjunction with other texts like *puraana* and *itihaasa*. Hence the defect pointed out by *poorvapaksha* stands vitiated.

In fact, the *smritis* like *Paashupaata-agama* are themselves unauthentic for the reason that the results of performance of some tasks as explained in them, are not obtained on such performance. Even where obtained, they are not in the same sequence or form as explained in the said texts. Hence they cannot be considered as *aapta vaakya*. (To be an *aapta vaakya*, a sentence needs to be constructed by an expert in the subject, who has no defect of expression or an intent of deceit, for the benefit of a genuine learner whom the author considers as fit and eligible for such knowledge and that the occasion should not be that of a casual chat, humor, imitation of others etc. In this case, since the said results are not obtained on performance, the knowledge and intent of the author become questionable and hence not an *aapta vaakya*).

Though in the earlier chapter (*shastra-yonitvaat*) this subject is discussed to dispel the authenticity of *smritis* that do not fall in line with *Vedas*, it is discussed here again based on the presentation of the *poorvapaksha* that such *smritis* are authentic on account of

realization of the stated results on performing the prescribed tasks. While some stated results are realized, some or not. If authenticity is to be implied based on realization, it would be equally fair to imply inauthenticity based on non-realization.

॥ ॐ नविलक्षणत्वादस्य तथात्वं च शब्दात् ॐ ॥ २॥

na vilakshana-tvaad-asya tathaatvam cha shabdaat - 2

॥ ॐ दृश्यते तु ॐ ॥

drishyate tu;

अत्र फलविसंवादेन अपस्मृतीनामप्रामाण्ये तत एव श्रुतिश्रौतस्मृत्योरप्रामाण्यं स्यादिति शङ्कनादापवादिकी सङ्गतिः । श्रुतिः श्रौतस्मृतिश्च किं प्रमाणमुत नेति सन्देहः । “वृष्टिकामः कारीर्या यजेत” इत्याद्युक्तकारीर्याद्यनुष्ठानेऽपि वृष्ट्याद्यदृष्ट्या फलविसंवादेन अपस्मृतिवत् अपौरुषेयत्वेऽपि अप्रमाणमेव श्रुतिः, अपौरुषेयैव न भवति च श्रुतिः । श्रौतस्मृतिश्चैव न मानमिति पूर्वः पक्षः ॥

In the previous chapter, it was decided that the *smritis* that are not in line with *Vedas* are unauthentic since the results explained in them could not be realized on performing the acts prescribed for the same. This is equally true even in the case of *Vedas* and *smritis* that follow *Vedas*. How then can we discriminate between them and call some as authentic and some not? *Veda* says “those who desire rains should perform *kaareeri yaaga*” and we do not receive rains even after performing the said *yaaga*. Thus, even *vedas* and *smritis* following them, are also unauthentic.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ “वाचा विरूप नित्यया” इत्यादि देवतादिनये भाष्योक्तयुक्त्या च श्रुतेरपौरुषेयत्वेन श्रौतस्मृतेस्तदनुसारित्वेन च अनाशङ्कितदोषतया साक्षिवत्प्रमाणत्वात् । प्रामाण्यस्य च “न चक्षुर्न श्रोत्रमि”त्यादिना वेदार्थस्य

चक्षुराद्ययोग्यत्वोक्त्या संवादानपेक्षतया स्वत एव ज्ञेयत्वात् फलविसंवाद-
रूपापवादस्य च अधिकारिविशेषाणां फलदर्शनेनासिद्धेः । क्वचित्फलविसंवाद-
निमित्तस्य च कर्त्रादिवैगुण्यनिमित्तत्वेनोपपत्तेः । अपस्मृतीनां तैः संवादेनैव
तत्प्रामाण्यज्ञप्त्यङ्गीकारेण तद्वैषम्यात् प्रमाणमेव श्रुतिः श्रौतस्मृतयश्च इति ॥२॥

Vedas themselves say that they are eternal. It has also been discussed and proved in the previous division that *Vedas* are *apaurusheya* – unauthored. An *apaurusheya* sentence cannot be defective since it does not have the essentials of a cause of defect. Since the subject matter of *Vedas* are beyond the perception of eyes, ears etc, they cannot be demonstrated in a lab to prove the authenticity. Hence they have to be accepted as self authentic like the knowledge we obtain from the senses. Would anybody seek an evidence of authenticity for what he sees book as a book? It is self authentic. So are *Vedas*.

Non realization of results narrated in *Vedas* is not because *Vedas* have lied but because the performer has his own limitations that are blocking the realization. As otherwise, how come the results are obtained by some others? This logic however cannot be extended to other *smritis* since their very basis of authenticity is on the realization of results.

॥ ॐ अभिमानिव्यपदेशस्तु विशोषानुगतिभ्याम् ॐ ॥ ३ ॥

Abhimaani-vyapadeshastu-vishesha-anugatibhyaam - 3

॥ ॐ दृश्यते च ॐ ॥

drishyate cha;

पूर्वत्र विसंवादाख्ययुक्तिमात्रविरोधो निरस्तः । अत्र श्रुतेः प्रतीतार्थप्रच्युति-
कारित्वेन दृढयुक्तिविरोधो निरस्यत इति सङ्गतिः । "मृदब्रवीदापोऽब्रुन् तत्तेज

ऐक्षते" त्यादिश्रुतिः प्रमाणमुत नेति सन्देहः । आदिकालीनपृथिव्यादेर्वकृत्वाद्य-
भिधात्री श्रुतिर्न मानमिति पूर्वः पक्षः ॥ मृन्न वक्त्री जडत्वान्मृत्त्वाद्वा सम्मतवदिति
युक्तिविरुद्धार्थकत्वाज्जडस्य ज्ञानेन्द्रियहीनस्य कर्तृत्वेक्षितृत्वादेरयोगात्
इदानीन्तनमृदादिकारणत्वेन अनुमितस्य वा परसिद्धमात्रस्य वा मृदादेः
पक्षीकारेण युक्तेः धर्मिग्राहकमानबाधस्याप्यभावात्, एवं च एवमादिवेदैकदेशस्य
अमानत्वात्, तत्सामान्यादितरेषु तथात्वमिति जैमिनीयन्यायेन कृत्स्नवेदस्यापि
अमानत्वमिति॥

The previous chapter dealt with the doubt on the authenticity of *Vedas* based on non-realization of results spelt therein. This chapter deals with the statements in *Veda* that are illogical and cause abandoning of their apparent meaning. Some vedic texts sound absurd. To illustrate, they say that the clay spoke, water spoke, fire saw etc. Whether these statements are to be considered authentic or not. Though it is clear that the present day clay etc are inert objects that cannot speak, the doubt now is on capabilities of clay etc that existed at the time of creation of universe. The *poorvapaksha* says that even the initial clay could not have spoken since even that was *jada* (inert material) and that it was after all clay (had the *mritva dharma*). How can an inert material which is devoid of senses of perception and action perform any act? This conclusion however has a technical flaw viz. *dharmigraahaka maana baadha* (In the derivation that initial clay could not have spoken, the reasoning adopted is that it was *jada*. Now, the question is how did we know that it was *jada*. It is through *vedas*, for a past object cannot be known through *pratyaksha* – perception. This means, that the logic is dependent on *Veda*. In technical terms, *Veda* is *upajeevya* and logic based on it is *upajeevaka*. Since the logic is dependent on *Veda*, it cannot confront its very guardian, *veda*).

The *poorvapakshi* now says that he does not base his logic on *Veda* for adducing the existence of *jadatva* in the initial clay but through

another logic that it is the cause of the present day clay which is known to be *jada* - Since the initial clay was the cause of present day clay and since the present day clay is *jada*, it is but logical to infer that the initial clay was also *jada*. Hence the logic that initial clay could not have spoken because it was *jada* is not marred by the opposition of an *upajeevya pramaana*.

If some texts of *Veda* are thus proved to be unauthentic, it needs to be extrapolated to mean that all vedic texts are unauthentic.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ प्रागुक्तदिशा नित्यत्वेन अनाशङ्कितदोषस्य वेदस्य अप्रामाण्यायोगात् जडस्य वक्तृत्वाद्ययोगाच्च वेदप्रामाण्यमृदादिवक्तृत्वाद्यभिधायकत्वयोः द्वयोः यावता विनानुपपत्तिः तावतः कल्प्यत्वात् तदुभयान्यथानुपपत्त्या "पृथिव्याद्यभिमानिन्यो देवताः प्रथितौजसः" इत्यादि (भविष्यत्पुराण) वचनेन महतां प्रत्यक्षेण च अभिमानिचेतनस्य वक्तृत्वाद्युपयोगिविग्रहादिमत्वस्य अस्मदाद्यनुपलब्धिबाधनिरासाय अन्तर्धानशक्तिमत्वस्य इत्येवमादेः सिद्धत्वात् मृदादिस्थमृत्वादिरूपप्रवृत्तिनिमित्तस्य अभिमान्यधीनतया तदधीनत्वन्यायेन तच्छब्दानां तदभिमानिदेवतास्वेव मुख्यत्वाच्च मृदादिशब्दितदेवतानामेव वक्तृत्वाद्यङ्गीकारे युक्तिविरोधाभावात् प्रमाणमेव वेदः इति ॥ ३ ॥

As explained earlier, *Vedas* cannot be wrong since they are unauthored (*apourusheya*). It is also true that the inert materials cannot speak or see. Thus, in order to resolve the conflict, some assumptions are to be brought in place. They are, that there are regulatory deities for the *jada* objects of clay, water etc. These deities have bodies of their own that would facilitate functions like talking and seeing. Though these deities have bodies, they are not visible to all on account of their power to remain invisible. These assumptions are not baseless – They have the support of a logic of inevitability to resolve the referred context, that of the statement in *bhavishyat-puraana* that the regulatory deities have great strength and that of the perception of the wise people who have achieved an

elevated spiritual status. Hence it is reassured that *Vedas* are authentic.

॥ ॐ असदिति चेन्न प्रतिषेधमात्रत्वात् ॐ ॥ ४ ॥

asaditi cheenna pratishedha-maatratvaat – 4

॥ ॐ अपीतौ तद्वत्प्रसङ्गादसमञ्जसम् ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ न तु दृष्टान्तभावात् ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ स्वपक्षदोषाच्च ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ तर्काप्रतिष्ठानादप्यन्यथानुमेयमिति चेदेवमप्यनिर्मोक्षप्रसङ्गः ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ एतेन शिष्टा अपरिग्रहा अपि व्याख्याताः ॐ ॥

apeetou tadvat-prasangaad-asamanjasam; na tu drishtaanta-bhaavaat; svapaksha-doshaaccha; tarkaa-pratisthaanaad-apyanyatha-anumeyamiti ched-evam-apyanirmoksha-prasangah; etena shishthaa aparigrahaa api vyaakhyaataah;

अत्र श्रुतिसहितयुक्त्यविरोधाय मृदादिशब्दानां अन्यार्थतायां असदादिश्रुति-सहितयुक्त्यविरोधाय "सदेव सौम्ये"ति (छां. ६-२-१) सदादिशब्दानां अन्यार्थतेति किमु वाच्यमिति पूर्वसिद्धान्तन्यायेन शङ्कनात्सङ्गतिः। विष्णोर्विश्व-कर्तृत्वावेदकः "यतो वा" इत्यादिवेदः प्रमाणं उत नेति सन्देहः। न प्रमाणमिति पूर्वपक्षः ॥ लयवृत्तिविश्वप्रागभावः विश्वहेतुः अनन्यथासिद्धनियतपूर्वक्षणवृत्तित्वात् सम्प्रतिपन्नवदितियुक्त्या "असदेव इदमग्र आसीत्" इत्यसच्छब्दितविश्वप्रागभाव-हेतुत्वपरश्रुतिसहितया तस्य हेतुत्वे सिद्धे विमताः भावाः प्रलये असन्तः भावत्वात् कार्यवत् इति लये भावमात्रासिद्धौ कार्यस्य सकर्तृकत्वनियमात् परिशेषेण "असदेव तन्मनोऽकुरुते"त्यादिश्रुतिसहितेन ईश्वरादिकल्पनात् लाघवेन उपादानस्यापि प्रागभावस्यैव कर्तृत्वादिति प्रागभावकर्तृत्वसाधकयुक्ति-विरुद्धत्वात्। वृक्षेण स्थीयत इत्यादौ कर्त्रर्थक तृतीयायाः अचेतनेऽपि दर्शनेन अभावस्य कर्तृत्वस्वीकारे अनुपपत्त्यभावाच्च। किञ्च कूलपतनवत् अकर्तृकमेव जगत् कार्यत्वात् घटवत्, जीवकर्तृकं वा दध्यादिवज्जडकर्तृकं वा इत्यादि युक्तिभिः "अकस्माद्धीदमाविरासीत्" इत्यादिश्रुतिसहिताभिर्विरुद्धत्वाच्चेति ॥

This chapter begins with the objection that if the words in *Vedas* are to be interpreted to mean something beyond the apparent, for

the reason that the apparent meaning does not fit in to logic, why not for the same reason interpret the words like “sat” as in “*sat eva soumya idam agre aseet*” to mean other than *Vishnu*. The *poorvapaksha* explains how *Vishnu* cannot be considered as the creator of this universe as under:

To be a cause, it should invariably exist in the immediate prior moment of creation. The *praagabhava* of the universe exists in the immediate prior moment of the creation of universe. *Praagabhava* means the *abhaava*, absence or vacuity of an object that exists prior to its creation. The other counterpart is *Pradhvamsa-abhaava*, the *abhaava* vacuity, which comes into existence post destruction of an object.

Since *praagabhava* invariably exists before the creation, the one related to the universe and existed during the final deluge is considered by the *poorvapakshi* as the cause of the universe. There is an evidence in *Vedas* that says there was only ‘*asat*’ prior to creation and this *asat* is nothing but the *praagabhava* of the universe.

The logic that “no existent material (*bhaava padaartha*) was present during deluge, for all existent materials would perish during deluge like the earthen pot, would also support the theory that there was nothing that can be considered as cause of the universe.

Causes are a variety. The raw material is called *upaadaana* and the doer is called *karta*. Since nothing existed during the deluge, it is but natural to infer that the *praagabhava*, the vacuity itself was the doer as well. Even veda says that there was only *asat*, vacuum and that decided to create universe.

While the above is the proposition of one *poorvapaksha*, the other says that the universe got created on its own. There was no doer, the way we find no doer for an old wall to collapse. Another says, that the universe is created by some or the other *jeeva*, the way we see objects being created by *jeevas*. The third one says, the inert matter itself is the creator of the universe the way curd is created by milk.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ विष्णोः कर्तृत्वस्य ज्ञानचिकीर्षादिमत्त्वरूपतया अभिमतत्वेन तृतीयायोगित्वमात्रत्वाभावात् । तस्य च स्वरूपत एव निषेधात्मके अयोगात् । कार्यनाशे कारणमात्रावशेषनियमेन प्रलयेऽभावमात्रावशेषापत्तेः । तन्मात्रावशेषस्य च विमतोत्पत्तिः भावाधीना उत्पत्तित्वात् । विमतो विनाशः सशेषनाशत्वात् सम्मतवत् इत्यादिभिः लये भावसत्त्वावेदकयुक्तिभिः विरुद्धत्वात् । भावत्वयुक्तेरुक्तदिशा सत्प्रतिपक्षितत्वेन लयकाले व्यभिचारेण च दुष्टतया प्रलयेऽभाववशेषस्य अप्रामाणिकत्वाच्च अनिष्टत्वात् शुष्कतर्कस्याप्रतिष्ठत्वेऽपि ईशकर्तृत्वागमसहायास्मदुक्तस्य (सहायतया अस्मदुक्तस्य) प्रामाण्यसम्भवात् । निष्कारणत्वजीवकारणत्वादेः उक्तयुक्तिविरोधेनैव निरासाच्च असद्वेत्यादिश्रुतीनां च “एतेन सर्वे व्याख्याताः” (ब्र.सू. १-४-२९) इत्युक्तन्यायेन ईशपरत्वात् प्रमाणमेव विष्णुकर्तृत्वश्रुतिजातमिति ॥ ४ ॥

Vishnu is considered as the cause of universe in the form of *karta* (doer) on account of the intelligence and intent he has in the creation. This cannot be attributed to a vacuum that primarily means non-existence of anything. The logic that all existent materials did not exist on their destruction is ill founded, for on destruction of anything, it leaves the debris or its cause material. This apart, the conclusion that there was no existent material during deluge has exceptions like “time”, “space” that makes the maxim infructuous.

Thus, there is no evidence to say that only vacuum existed during the deluge and hence it cannot be considered as a cause of any kind, let alone as the doer of the universe. The word *asat* in the vedic text does not refer to vacuum or *praag-abhaava* as indicated by the *poorvapaksha* but primarily means and addresses *Vishnu* as explained in the earlier chapter (1-4-29).

The propositions that the universe got created on its own - without a doer, created by some *jeeva* or by the inert *jada* are all fraught with defect of non-existence of acceptable examples to prove their point. In all the quoted examples, it is well understood that there is some *chetaana*, living-being behind the tasks.

॥ ॐ भोक्त्रापत्तेरविभागश्चेत्स्याल्लोकवत् ॐ ॥ ५ ॥

bhoktraapatter-avibhaagashchet-syaal-lokavat - 5

पूर्वं ब्रह्मणोऽसत्त्वमुपेत्य अभावस्यैव कर्तृत्वं शङ्कितम् । इह तु उक्तदिशा तत्सत्त्वमुपेत्य जीवस्यापि कर्तृत्वमाशङ्क्यते इति सङ्गतिः । विष्णुरेव कर्ता इत्यादिश्रुतिसमन्वयेनोक्तं विश्वकर्तृत्वं युक्तं न वेति सन्देहः । न युक्तमिति पूर्वः पक्षः । “परेऽव्यये सर्व एकीभवन्ती”ति (मुं. ३-२-७) श्रुत्या ईशस्य मुक्तैरेक्यात्, अन्यस्य अन्यत्वाददर्शनेन प्रागैक्यस्यावश्यकत्वेन संसारिजीवा-भिन्नत्वादिति श्रुतिसिद्धाभिन्नत्वयुक्तिविरुद्धत्वात् । न च प्रागप्यैक्ये अभूततद्भावार्थक “च्चि” प्रत्ययायोगः । प्राग्भेदस्याप्यङ्गीकारात् तन्निवृत्त्यर्थत्वेन तदुपपत्तेः ॥ एवं च जीवेशयोरेक्यस्य तयोः सर्वकर्तृत्वाल्पकर्तृत्वादिविरुद्ध-धर्मत्यागेन, ईशधर्मत्यागेन तस्य जीवसालक्षणेन वा, जीवधर्मत्यागेन वा तस्य ईशसालक्षणेन वा सम्भवेन आद्यद्वितीययोः विष्णोः सर्वकर्तृत्वस्यासम्भवात् अन्त्येऽतिव्याप्तेरिति ॥

While the previous chapter began negating the very existence of *Vishnu* as a creator of the universe, his presence and role as a

creator is accepted here in this chapter but the theory that he alone is the creator is challenged.

Mundaka Upanishat says that in *moksha* (salvation) everybody becomes one with God. No two different things can become one. Hence if the *upanishat* says that *jeevas* become one with God, it implies that they have been one and the same even earlier. Though the word “becomes” (indicated by “chvi” suffix – “ee” in “ekee”) denotes happening of something which did not exist earlier, it does not impact the concept of oneness of *jeeva* and God even before *moksha*. The status of *jeeva* and God is that of *bheda-abheda* (unity with difference). The word “becomes” denotes the removal of the “difference” component. The conflicting characteristics of God being omnipotent and *jeeva* having very limited capabilities can be resolved by excluding such attributes and considering only the core of *chaitanya* for understanding their unity.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ एकीभावश्रुतेः “निरञ्जनः परमं साम्यमुपैति” इति पूर्वेण “परात्परं पुरुषमुपैति दिव्यं” (मुं.५-३) इत्युत्तरवाक्येन “यथोदकं शुद्धे शुद्धमासिक्तं तादृगेवे”त्यादिवाक्यान्तरेण च विरोधेन प्राग्भिनाभिन्नस्यापि पश्चादत्यन्ताभेदस्य क्वाप्यदर्शनेन च परे इति सप्तमीबलेन मुख्यैक्यपरत्वानुपपत्त्या सायंगोष्ठे गाव एकीभवन्ति इत्यादाविव स्थानैक्यादिपरत्वेन जीवैक्यस्यैवासिद्धेः युक्तं विष्णोः विश्वकर्तृत्वमिति ॥ ५ ॥

The words of *upanishat* that *Jeeva* becomes one with God in *moksha* are not intended to speak of oneness between them but only to indicate an extraordinary similarity in *moksha*. The same *upanishat* clarifies this aspect through an example of pure water poured from a tumbler in a bucket already having water, the water of tumbler becomes similar to that of bucket. Had it been a union, there would not have been an increase in the volume in the bucket.

There is also no evidence of two different things, even if they have *bheda-abheda* relationship, becoming one. Hence becoming one would only mean, assembling at one place or coming in agreement of thoughts. We see such usage in “all the trekking teams have become one in the destination”, “the warring colleagues have become one” etc. Hence the fact that God alone is the creator remains unchallenged.

॥ ॐ तदनन्यत्वमारम्भणशब्दादिभ्यः ॐ ॥ ६ ॥

Tadananytvam-aarambhana-shabdaadibhyah – 6

॥ ॐ भावे चोपलब्धेः ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ सत्त्वाच्चावरस्य ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ
असद्व्यपदेशान्नेति चेन्न धर्मान्तरेण वाक्यशेषात् ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ युक्तेः शब्दान्तराच्च
ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ पटवच्च ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ यथा प्राणादिः ॐ ॥

*bhaave cha upalabdheh; satvaaccha-avarasya; asad-vyapadeshaan-neti
chenna dharmaantarena vaakyasheshaat; patavaccha; yathaa praanaadih;*

पूर्वत्र ईशस्य विश्वकर्तृत्वमेव नेति शङ्कापास्ता । अत्र तु श्रुतिसिद्धं तदुपेत्य
स्वानधीनसत्तादियुक्तसाधनापेक्षं तदिति शङ्का अपास्यत इति सङ्गतिः ।
जन्मादिसूत्रोक्तं विष्णोस्स्वातन्त्र्येण कर्तृत्वं युक्तं न वेति सन्देहः । न युक्तमिति
पूर्वः पक्षः ॥ महदादिसृष्टिः कर्त्रन्यस्वतन्त्रसाधनसापेक्षा सृष्टित्वात्
पटादिसृष्टिवत् इत्यादिबहुयुक्तिविरुद्धत्वात् “अद्भ्यः सम्भूतः पृथिव्यै रसाच्चे”ति
(पुरुष सू.) श्रुतौ अबादिस्वतन्त्रसाधनान्तरोक्तिविरोधाच्च । ईश्वरसृष्टित्वात्तद-
नपेक्षायां ईशाधीनसाधनान्तरपेक्षापि न स्यादिति ॥

while the role of God as a creator of the universe was questioned in the previous chapter, whether or not he uses tools, raw materials and assistants, that are independent of him for such creation is the subject of discussion in this chapter. It is seen in the world that the creator of objects uses raw materials and tools for his creation. The existence of such raw materials and tools are not dependent on the

creator. Extending the logic, it can be inferred that God also has used tools and raw materials that are independent of him for their existence and attributes. *Purusha sookta* text of *vedas* says that God manifested himself along with water, earth and qualities like *rasa* (taste) while creating the universe. This indicates that he has used materials like earth, water etc that are independent of him.

If God's creation is to be taken as an exception to the rule that a creator uses tools etc that are independent of such creator because he is God, for the same reason, he should not have used even the tools etc that are dependent on him. Hence it is logical to say that God's creation of universe has a necessity to use objects that are independent of him. Meaning, he is dependent on external objects for his creation – in a way, his independence is challenged.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ युक्तमेव स्वतन्त्रकर्तृत्वं विष्णोः "किंस्विदासीदधिष्ठानमारम्भणम्" इति (ऋ. १०-८१-२) श्रुतौ अधिष्ठानादेः साधनस्याक्षेपात् तथा "नासदासीन्नो सदासीत् तदानीं नासीद्रजः तम आसीत् तमसा गूळ्हमग्रे" इत्यादिश्रुतौ (क. १०-१२९-२) भूतादिसाधनासत्त्वकथनात् तयोश्च साधनसत्त्वावेदकश्रुत्यन्तरविरोधेन तम आसीत् इत्यादिवाक्यशेषविरोधेन च स्वरूपेणाक्षेपासत्त्वयोरयोगेन तत्स्वातन्त्र्यनिषेधपरत्येन तथा श्रुत्या विमता सृष्टिः न कर्त्रन्यस्वतन्त्रसाधनापेक्षा परतन्त्रकर्त्रन्यत्वे सति सृष्टित्वात् इत्यादिव्यतिरेक्यनुमानैश्च प्रागुक्तयुक्तेरविरुद्धत्वात् । प्राणादीनां ईशानुप्रविष्टत्वेन अस्वातन्त्र्यवत् "प्रकृतिं पुरुषं चैव प्रविश्य" इति (कूर्म पु.) स्मृत्या इशानुप्रविष्टत्वेन साधनानां अस्वातन्त्र्यनिश्चयेन बाधितत्वात् । कर्त्रन्यस्वतन्त्रसाधनस्य श्रुत्यादिप्रमाणैरनुपलम्भात् "अद्भ्यः" इत्यादेः "द्रव्यं कर्म च कालश्च इत्यादिश्रुत्या अवरसाधनसत्त्वपरत्वेन तद्विरोधाभावात् ईश्वरस्यापि लीलया सृष्टौ साधनान्तरोपादानसम्भवाच्चेति ॥ ६ ॥

Rigveda says "what (after all) was the base and what (after all) was the tool for God's creation"? This expression is certainly not to

know or explain the base and tools used by God but a sarcastic one indicating their insignificant role. This could have been an inquiry had there been a reply in the subsequent text. That is absent. Thus, this text denies the existence and use of any independent object in support of the creation.

While one vedic text says that there was neither a non-existent object nor an existent object (*sat* and *asat*) etc during deluge, the same text says in the same sentence that there existed *tamas* (darkness) and that everything else was hidden in *tamas*. This also confirms the fact that things existed during deluge but they were not active and significant enough to be considered as existing. A negation of their existence would thus mean a negation of their independence and not of a factual existence.

Even the deities like *praana* who had played a significant role in the creation were also not independent since they were energized and propelled by God who entered and stayed in them.

Another vedic text says that everything, of every object including its very existence, attributes, action etc are under the grace of God and hence wherever the vedic text says that objects like clay, water etc have caused the creation, it is God who has used such objects which are entirely at his command and disposal just to play with them and not as a necessity for his creations.

॥ ॐ इतरव्यपदेशाद्धिताकरणादिदोषप्रसक्तिः ॐ ॥ ७ ॥

Itaravyapadeshaad-hitaakaranaadi-doshaprasaktih - 7

॥ ॐ अधिकं तु भेदनिर्देशात् ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ अश्मादिवच्च तदनुपपत्तिः ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ
उपसंहारदर्शनात्नेति चेत्क्षीरवद्धि ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ देवादिवदपि लोके ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ
कृत्स्नप्रसक्तिर्निरवयवत्वशब्दकोपो वा ॐ ॥

*adhikam tu bhedanirdeshaat; ashmaadivaccha tadanupapattih;
 upasamhaara-darshanaan-neti cetksheeravaddhi; devaadivadapi loke;
 kritsna-prasaktir-niravayavatva-shabda-kopo vaa;*

अत्र पूर्वोक्तं प्राणादिजीवानामस्वातन्त्र्यं अयुक्तं जीवानां स्वतन्त्र-
 कर्तृत्वानुभवात् इत्याक्षेपात् सङ्गतिः। जन्मादिसूत्रे अभिमतं विष्णोरेव
 स्वतन्त्रकर्तृत्वं युक्तं न वेति सन्देहः । पूर्वपक्षस्तु ॥ "जीवाद्भवन्ति भूतानि"
 इत्यादिश्रुत्या "अहमिदं करोमी"त्यादिस्वतन्त्रकर्तृत्वानुभवेन च संवादिन्या,
 जीवः कर्ता चेतनत्वात् सिद्धान्त्यभिमतेशवत् इति युक्त्या विष्णुरेव स्वतन्त्रः
 कर्ता इत्यस्य विरुद्धत्वादेवं च घटादौ जीवस्यैव कर्तृत्वे सिद्धे लाघवेन
 महदादावपि स एव कर्तृत्यस्य न्याय्यत्वात् ईशस्य च अयोग्यत्वे
 कदाप्यप्रत्यक्षतापत्त्या श्रवणादिवैयर्थ्येन योग्यत्वे वाच्ये सदा सर्वत्र सतः
 इहेदानीमनुपलम्भेन योग्यानुपलब्ध्या तदभावनिश्चयेन तत्कर्तृत्वकल्यनस्य
 गौरवपराहतत्वाच्च न युक्तं तत्कर्तृत्वमित्येकः । अन्यस्तु महदादिकर्तृत्वस्य जीवे
 अनुभवविरोधात् अस्तु तत्रेशः कर्ता न तु घटादावपि तस्य
 अनुभवसिद्धजीवमात्रकर्तृत्वे कल्पनालाघवादिति ॥

The conclusion in the previous chapter that nothing, including the deities like *praana* is independent is challenged in this chapter. Thereby, the premise that *Vishnu* alone was the creator of the universe is also questioned.

It is the experience of all that we do the things like walking, talking, eating etc independent of anybody. Even the veda says (*jeevat bhavanti bhootaani*) that the objects around are created by *jeevas*. The maxim "*jeevas* are *kartas* (doers) because they are *chetanas* like God" also goes in support of the claim that *jeevas* are independent doers. We see around objects like pot being created by *jeevas*. It is quite logical to extrapolate this experience to infer that even the universe is created by independent *jeevas*.

If God is to be considered as the creator of everything, it needs to be assumed that he has a body. Since he is omnipresent, he should have been visible right in front of us now and at all times. But he is not. In order to resolve this conflict, we need to say that he is invisible. If he is thus not capable of being seen like the qualities of virtue and sin, then all the preachings of vedas to achieve his *pratyaksha*, physically seeing him is senseless. If is capable of being seen and still not seen, it would only mean that he does not exist. Thus too many assumptions are a defect in logic called *kalpanagourava* and even with all that, it cannot be concluded that he exists and that he is the creator.

Another version of *poorvapaksha* is that be he the creator of the core aspects like *mahat-tatva*, *ahankaara-tatva* etc of the universe. Being primitive things and base materials they may not be the creation of *jeevas*. Why should we consider that him as the creator of small objects around us which are seen as creations of *jeevas*? This means that God alone is not the creator but *jeevas* as well.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ जीवस्यैव स्वतन्त्रकर्तृत्वे स्वहिताकरणस्य स्वाहितकरणस्य च अनुभवसिद्धस्यायोगात् । तृणोद्धरणादौ कृत्स्नसामर्थ्येन एकदेशेन वा प्रवर्तते इत्यस्यानुभवेन "एष नित्यो निरवयव" इति श्रुत्या च विरुद्धत्वेन प्रवृत्तेरेवा-योगाच्च । बाधकात्सदा सर्वत्र स्थितस्यापि ईशस्य देवादिवत् पिशाचादिवच्च अन्तर्धानशक्त्यानुपलम्भसम्भवेन "जीवाद्भवन्ति" इत्यादिश्रुतेः अपूर्वतालिङ्गेन ईशपरत्वोपपत्तेः । स्वतन्त्रकर्तृतानुभवस्य च चार्वाकस्य जडदेहस्वातन्त्र्यबुद्धे-रिव ईशाधीने जीवे भ्रमत्वाच्चेतनत्वयुक्तेश्च अश्मादिवदस्वतन्त्रत्वात् न जीवः स्वतन्त्रकर्तेति । सत्प्रतिपक्षत्वेन अप्रयोजकतया स्वातन्त्र्याभावाच्च साधका-भावाच्च न जीवः स्वतन्त्रः, प्रमितेश्वरः घटादौ महदादौ च स्वतन्त्रकर्तेत्यङ्गीकारे गौरवस्य प्रामाणिकत्वेन अदोषत्वाच्च द्वावपि पूर्वपक्षावयुक्ताविति विष्णोरेव कर्तृत्वं युक्तमिति ॥ फलं तु पूर्वोत्तरपक्षयोः लक्षणस्य यथाक्रमं असम्भवातिव्याप्ती तत्समाधिश्च सिद्धान्ते ॥७॥

Had *jeeva* been an independent doer, why then is he not able to do what is good to him and to avoid undesirable happenings to him? This itself proves that he is not independent.

The inherent strength of *jeeva* is no different from him. *Veda* says that *jeeva* has no components. Hence if he were to be independent and be doing different tasks on his own, he should have been applying the same strength for every task, be it just lifting a blade of grass or a heavy box. That is not the fact. This also proves that he is not independent.

If someone is not visible, it is not necessary that he does not exist. It could be due to the capability of remaining invisible and becoming visible at will like in the case of ghosts and deities. Hence not being seen cannot be construed as non-existence of God.

Amongst the rules of interpretation, *apoorvata* (unusual) is considered a strong reason for accepting the meaning of a statement when it means something strange. Thus the vedic statement “*jeevaat bhavanti bhootaani*” (objects are created by *jeeva*) need to be interpreted to mean God by the word *jeeva*, as otherwise there is nothing great if it says what is seen day in day out by everyone.

The experience that we do the tasks independently is an illusion like the one of *charvaaka* who preaches that it is only this inert (*jada*) body that does the tasks.

Since there is no evidence to show that *jeeva* is an independent doer, it is to be concluded that all tasks, not just those of creation

of primary materials of the universe, are done by God and that he alone is the independent doer.

॥ ॐ श्रुतेस्तु शब्दमूलत्वात् ॐ ॥ ८ ॥

shrutestu shabda-moolatvaat – 8

॥ ॐ आत्मनि चैवं विचित्राश्च हि ॐ ॥ ॐ स्वपक्षदोषाच्च ॐ ॥
॥ ॐ सर्वोपेता च तद्वर्शनात् ॐ ॥ ॐ विकरणत्वात्नेति चेत्तदुक्तम् ॐ ॥
aatmani chaivam vichitraashcha hi; svapaksha-doshaaccha;
sarvopetaa cha taddarshanaat; vikaranatvaan-neti chet-taduktam;

अत्र कृत्स्नप्रसक्त्यादिदोषः जीववदीशस्य कर्तृत्वेऽपि स्यादिति शङ्कनात्सङ्गतिः । विष्णोस्सर्वकर्तृत्वं युक्तं न वेति सन्देहः ॥ पूर्वपक्षस्तु ॥ विष्णोस्तृणादानाद्यल्पकार्येऽपि कृत्स्नशक्त्या प्रवृत्तौ अप्रेक्षावत्त्वापातात् । एकदेशेन प्रवृत्तौ नेहनानेत्यादिनिरंशश्रुतिव्याकोपात् जीवादीशे विशेषासिद्ध्या तत्रैवायं दोषो नेशे इत्यस्य च कल्पकाभावात् “अचक्षुःश्रोत्रं तदपाणिपादं” इति श्रुत्या हस्तश्रोत्रादिकरणाभावाच्च अयुक्तं विष्णोः कर्तृत्वमिति ॥

The reasoning that *jeeva* should have been applying the same efforts for all tasks, small and big alike, since he does not have components holds good even for *Vishnu*. *Veda* says “*neha naanaa asti kinchana*” - there is no multiplicity in God. No sane person would spend equal amount of efforts for all tasks. Hence the objection raised for considering *jeeva* as doer holds good even for God. Moreover, to do anything one should have a body. Without eyes, ears, limbs etc how can anyone do any task? *Veda* says that God does not have eyes, ears, legs, hands. Hence he cannot be considered as doer.

सिद्धान्तस्तु । “योऽसौ विरुद्धोऽविरुद्धः मनुर्मनु”रित्यादि (पैङ्गीश्रुतिः) श्रुत्या लोके विरुद्धधर्माणां ईशेऽविरुद्धधर्मत्वोक्तेः तस्य शब्दैकगम्यतया शुष्कतर्का-

गोचरत्वेन तदबाध्यत्वात्, "विचित्रशक्तिः पुरुषः पुराण" इत्यादिश्रुत्या विष्णोर्युक्तिविरोधनिरासकनित्यसर्वविषयकानेकाघटितघटकशक्तिसत्त्वाच्च । जीवे च पूर्वोक्तस्य कस्याप्यभावेन ईशस्य ततो विशेषात् "न तस्य कार्यं करणम्" इत्यादिना प्रागुक्तश्रुतेः प्राकृतपरत्वात् ज्ञानानन्दादिगुणमयपाण्याद्यवयवयुक्त-देहसत्त्वाच्च युक्तं तत्कर्तृत्वमिति ॥ शास्त्रयोनिनये शुष्कतर्कस्य साधकत्वं नेत्युक्तम् । अत्र तु बाधकत्वं नेति भेदः ॥८॥

Paingee text of Vedas says those aspects that contradict elsewhere do not do so in *Vishnu*. To illustrate, he is both *manu* as well as *amanu* meaning the one having knowledge as well as the one who is not so. The intent of the text is that he is *manu* because he knows everything and *amanu* because he cannot be known fully by anyone. He has the eternal capability to do anything that is impossible for anybody to do and even contradict the logical reasoning. He cannot be known by sheer maxims or logical reasoning which do not have the backing of *vedas*. Since *jeeva* does not have the aforesaid capabilities, God cannot be equated with *jeeva* to attribute him the contradictions that prevented declaring *jeeva* as doer.

The statement in *Veda* that God does not have eyes etc is only to mean that he does not have a material body, not that he does not have any. He does have an eternal body that is made of his own natural *jnaana*, *aananda* etc and not that of physical matter.

॥ ॐ न प्रयोजनवत्त्वात् ॐ ॥ ९ ॥

na prayojanavatvaat - 9

॥ ॐ लोकवत्तु लीलाकैवल्यम् ॐ ॥

lokavattu leelaa-kaivalyam;

पूर्वं हेतुमुखदृढयुक्तिविरोधोऽपास्तः अत्र तु फलमुखदृढयुक्तिविरोधः निरस्यत इति सङ्गतिः। विष्णोः प्रागुक्तस्रष्टृत्वादिकं युक्तं न वेति सन्देहः । न युक्तमिति पूर्वः पक्षः। विष्णोः तत्प्रयोजनोद्देशेऽपूर्णतापत्या तादृशस्य चैत्रादेरिव सर्वकर्तृत्वायोगात् तदनुद्देशे च चेतनस्य प्रेक्षावतः प्रवृत्तेरेवायोगात् । दयाजन्यफलाभावेन दयया प्रवृत्तिरित्यस्याप्ययोगादिति ॥

While the previous chapter discussed whether or not God is capable of being a doer, the same is discussed here on the count of him deriving a benefit out of his tasks of creation of universe etc.

If God derives any benefit out of his tasks of Creation etc., it would naturally mean that he did not have such benefits prior to Creation. That would mean that he is an incomplete person like any other. An incomplete person cannot be the creator of this huge universe. It cannot even be said that he does such tasks without a benefit. Even an idiot would not do anything without a benefit let alone God who is the wisest of all. It is not even that he does these tasks out of courtesy since he has nothing to achieve out of it as he is *aaptakaama*, the one who has eternally achieved everything that he had wanted to.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ “देवस्यैष स्वभावोऽयम्” इत्यादि (मां. उ. ९-९) श्रुत्या विश्वसृष्ट्यादेः ईशस्वभावत्वात् स्वाभाविकस्य निमेषादेः प्रयोजनानुद्देशेऽपि दर्शनात् प्रेक्षावतामपि व्याख्यानादौ शिरोहस्तादिचालनस्य तदनुद्देशेऽपि दर्शनात् । फलाभावेऽपि अनायाससाध्याङ्गुल्यग्रादिचालनस्येव ईशस्य विश्वसृष्ट्यादेरनायाससाध्यत्वेन उपपन्नत्वाच्च । दयाजन्यस्य स्वफलस्याभावेऽपि परप्रयोजनस्य सत्त्वाच्च लीलारूपो विश्वसृष्ट्यादिरीशस्य युक्तः इति ॥ ९ ॥

The tasks of creation of Universe etc are not done by God for any benefit for himself. They are just his natural activities similar to our activities of blinking, movement of hand and head while giving a lecture, jumping or singing out of joy and so on. Actions that do

not require efforts, like casual movement of fingers do not require a purpose and need not result in a benefit. Creation etc are similar to these effortless activities for God. It is just a play with no exertion for him. His activities are not without a benefit. God's activities arising out of sympathy towards *jeevas*, have the benefit for *jeevas* though not for himself.

॥ ॐ वैषम्यनैर्घृण्ये न सापेक्षत्वात्तथाहि दर्शयति ॐ ॥ १० ॥

Vaishamya-naigrhrye na saapekshatvaat-tathaahi darshayati - 10

॥ॐ न कर्मविभागादिति चेन्नानादित्वात् ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ उपपद्यते चाप्युपलभ्यते च ॐ ॥
na karma-avibhaagaad-iti chenna-anaaditvaat;
upapadyate chaapy-upalabhate cha;

अत्र पूर्वनयोक्तपरप्रयोजनरूप फलविषये युक्तिविरोधो निरस्यत इति सङ्गतिः । विष्णोस्सर्वकर्तृत्वं युक्तं नवेति सन्देहः । न युक्तमिति पूर्वः पक्षः ॥ विष्णोः परपयोजनोद्देशेन प्रवत्तावुपेतायां तत्तदीयकर्मनिपेक्षतया तेषां तेषां फलदाने निर्निमित्तं विभागेन सुखदुःखादि ददतः वैषम्यनैर्घृण्यापातात् कर्मपेक्षया फलदाने कर्मणामपि तदधीनत्वेन निर्निमित्तं विभागेन सुकृतदष्कृते कारयतः पुनः वैषम्यापातात् । विष्ण्वनधीनत्वे अनधीनकर्मपेक्षत्वेन स्वातन्त्र्यच्युतेरिति ॥

It is said that God provides pleasures and pains to *jeevas*. Whether he depends on the *karma* of the respective *jeevas* while so providing the pleasures and pains or does he do so independent of *karma*. If does so depending on the *karma*, his independence becomes questionable. If he does not depend on *karma*, then he is seen as biased for bestowing favours for some and being cruel for others, for no reason. If he depends on *karma*, the question is whether such *karma* is done by *jeevas* independent of him or that he has only been responsible for the performance of such *karma* as well. If they are independent of him, then he cannot be called *sarva karta* (omnipotent) and the statement that he alone is

independent in absolute terms becomes invalid. If he has only got different *karma* done by *jeevas*, why then did he get bad tasks done by some and good by some others? The allegation of bias and cruelty remains intact.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ विष्णोस्तत्तदीयकर्मपेक्षया फलदानेऽपि कर्मणां स्वाधीनत्वेन अन्यथाकरणशक्तस्यापि एवमेव तदपेक्षया फलदाने प्राप्तवैषम्यादेश्च धर्मदेः फलहेतुत्वावेदकवेदाप्रामाण्यानापादकत्वेन विधिनिषेधातीतस्य तस्य प्रवाहतः अनादित्वेन पूर्वपूर्वतत्तदीयकर्मपेक्षया उत्तरोत्तरसुकृतादिकर्म कारयित्वा फलं ददातीत्यङ्गीकारेण विभागेन कर्मानुष्ठानस्य निर्निमित्तत्वाभावात् कर्मणामपि "एष ह्येव साधु कर्म कारयति" इत्यादिश्रुत्या स्वाधीनत्वेन अस्वातन्त्र्यानापत्तेश्च । अनादिकर्मणां स्वाधीनत्वेन अन्यथाकरणशक्तस्यापि एवमेव तदनपेक्षया फलदाने प्राप्त वैषम्यादेश्च धर्मदेः फलहेतुत्वावेदकवेदाप्रामाण्यानापादकत्वेन विधिनिषेधातीतस्य तस्य तद्वतो जीवस्येव प्रत्यवायाहेतुत्वात् अनादि-तत्तद्योग्यतानुसारित्वस्यैव समशब्दार्थतया "समोऽहं सर्वभूतेषु" (भ. गी. ९-२९) इत्युक्तसर्वसमत्वरूपसद्गुणाविरोधित्वाच्च । "स कारयेत्पुण्यमथापि पापं न तावता दोषवान्" (चतुर्वेदशिखा) इत्यादिश्रुतौ अदोषत्वेनोक्तत्वाच्च, अदोषत्वाद्युक्तं विष्णोस्सर्वकर्तृत्वमिति ॥ १० ॥

The response to *poorvapaksha* is provided in two lots. Initially, the dependence of God on *karma* in providing pleasure and pains are discussed and in the second lot, his adherence to the eternal inherent nature of *jeevas* and their perpetual tasks without altering them is dealt with.

God depends on *karma* of *jeevas* for providing them pleasures and pains for the following reasons:

If he does not do so but provides pleasures and pains arbitrarily, it would certainly be a bias and cruelty. Hence he does not do so.

Vedas prescribe certain benefits for specified tasks and certain punishments for violation of certain dicta. If he does not base distribution of pleasures and pains on *karma*, then he would be invalidating *vedas*, which he would not do.

Though he himself gets different *karma* done by *jeevas*, he does so based on their previous *karma* and hence it is not arbitrary. The previous *karma*, its previous and its previous etc are all under his control. Some one depending on things under control cannot be called as “dependent”. Hence his independence remains in tact.

The question now is when the perpetual *karma* was also under his control, why then did he not change them though he was capable to do so. True! though he is capable, he has not done so since he has no obligation to do so and he is not bound by any duty or responsibility whatsoever. A non-performance would not attract him sin the way it does for *jeevas*. He does not alter the nature of *jeevas* or their sequence of *karma*. Just because some one is capable of converting all crows in to swans by virtue of his mystic powers, he need not do such conversion.

Getting the tasks done from *jeevas* based on their inherent qualities is itself equality and not otherwise. It would not be equality if all animals are fed with grass. It does not suit the carnivorous ones, not even humans.

Hence the allegation of a bias or cruelty is misconceived. Since God alone provides the pleasures and pains his *sarvakartrutva* – omnipotence stands vindicated.

॥ ॐ सर्वधर्मोपपत्तेश्च ॐ ॥ ११ ॥

Sarva-dharmo-papatteshcha - 11

एवं स्मृत्वाद्येकैकगुणे एकैकदोषाभावे च युक्त्यविरोधः पूर्वनयेषूक्तः। अत्र तु उपसंहारत्वात् सर्वत्रेति सङ्गतिः । विष्णोरुक्तं निर्दोषगुणपूर्णत्वं युक्तं न वेति सन्देहः । न युक्तमिति पूर्वः पक्षः ॥ विष्णुः न निर्दोषत्वेन गुणपूर्तिमान् चेतनत्वात् चैत्रादिवदिति युक्तिविरोधात् अन्यथा दोषाभावे गुणित्वं च न स्यादिति ॥

After having dealt with individual traits of God in the earlier chapters on this section, this chapter, being the concluding one of this section deals with the absence of all defects and existence of all qualities in Vishnu generically.

The objection here is based on the analogy of all *jeevas* having qualities as well as defects and since *Vishnu* is also a *chetana* like *jeevas*, he also has defects and cannot be considered as flawless. If he be treated so, it should also be accepted that he does not have even the qualities. For, wherever we find qualities, we also find defects and vice versa.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ ब्रह्म सदा प्राप्तसर्वसद्गुणं तत्प्रेप्सुत्वे सति तत्र शक्तत्वात् सम्मतवत् । ब्रह्म सदा त्यक्तसर्वदोषं तज्जिहासुत्वे सति तत्र शक्तत्वादिति युक्त्यनुगृहीतया "गुणाः श्रुताः सुविरुद्धाश्च देवे" (सौपर्ण - जाबालिखिल) इत्यादिश्रुत्या निर्दोषगुणपूर्णस्य सिद्धेः चेतनत्वस्य अप्रयोजकत्वात् युक्तं विष्णोर्निर्दोषगुणपूर्णत्वम् । न च युक्तिद्वये विशेषणासिद्धिः । प्रेक्षावत्वेनैव तदनुमानात्, विशेष्यस्य च "श्रुतेस्तु" इति नये (ब्र. सू. २-१-२८) सिद्धत्वादिति ॥ फलं तु समन्वयाध्यायोक्तर्थस्य आक्षेपस्तत्समाधिश्च ॥ ११ ॥

The reply is simple. Whoever has a desire to possess some thing and is capable of doing so, will possess it. *Vishnu* has a desire to possess all good qualities and is capable of doing so. Hence he has all good qualities in him. Similarly, whoever does not desire to have something and is capable of avoiding it, will avoid it. *Vishnu*

does not desire to have defects – which sane person would desire defects in him? He is capable of avoiding them and hence he does not have any defects.

The *Souparna* text of *Vedas* says even those attributes that look contradictory in our perception stay in him in perfect order. Ex. A thing cannot be of miniature size and also of huge size. But *Vishnu* is described as *anoraneeyaan* – smaller than the smallest that one can even imagine and *mahato maheeyaan* – bigger than the biggest universe that we can imagine.

॥ इति श्रीराधवेन्द्रयतिकृतायां न्यायमुक्तावल्यां द्वितीयेऽध्याये प्रथमः पादः ॥

द्वितीयाध्याये द्वितीयः पादः

इतरेषां चानुपलब्धेरिति (ब्र.सू.२-१-२) स्मृतिनये गुणसूत्रोक्तहेतुविस्तृतिरूपत्वात् तदनन्तरं समयाविरोधः अत्रोच्यते इति वा प्रागुक्तदिशा वा पूर्वपादेनास्य सङ्गतिः । "अक्षपादकणादौ च" इत्यादिस्मृत्या समयानां द्वैविध्यात् हेतुमत्वेन हैतुकानां प्रबलत्वात् आदौ निरस्यन्ते ।

This section gets into the details of criticizing other philosophies that were hinted at in the earlier sutra "*itareshaam ca anupalabdheh*" (2-1-2). Other philosophies can be classified into *haituka* and *paashanda*. *Haitukas* relay extensively on logical derivations and *Paashandas* are non believers of *Vedas*. Since *haituka* thoughts are more appealing, they are handled in the first instance.

॥ ॐ रचनानुपपत्तेश्च नानुमानम् ॐ ॥ १ ॥

Rachana-anupapattescha na-anumaanam - 1

॥ ॐ प्रवृत्तेश्च ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ पयोऽम्बुवच्चेत्तत्रापि ॐ ॥

॥ ॐ व्यतिरेकानवस्थितेश्चानपेक्षत्वात् ॐ ॥

pravrittescha; payombuvaschet-tatraapi; vyatireka-anavasthiteshcha-anapekshatvat;

जन्मादिसूत्रोक्तं विष्णोस्सर्वकर्तृत्वं युक्तं न वेति सन्देहः । न युक्तमिति पूर्वः पक्षः । महदादिकार्यं स्वतन्त्रकारणजन्यं सजातीयकारणजन्यं वा कार्यत्वात् घटवदित्याद्यनुमानैः सिद्धं विश्वहेतुः प्रधानं स्वतन्त्रप्रवृत्तिरूपकर्तृत्ववत् वस्तुत्वात् अंब्वादिवत् इति, स्वतःपरिणामवदिति वा द्रव्यत्वात्क्षीरवदिति वाऽनन्यापेक्षतया प्रधानस्य कर्तृत्वं साधयता निरीश्वरसाङ्ख्यनयेन विरुद्धत्वादिति ॥

The initial raw materials for the universe like *mahat* must have been created by some independent cause or by a cause of similar nature since it is a creation like any other creation of an earthen pot etc. With another maxim the said independent creator is inferred as “*pradhaana* (the subtle inert matter)” - *Pradhana* must be an independent creator, since it is an object, like water (that flows on its own), must be a self transformer like milk, since it is a *dravya* (physical matter). Thus, the creator of universe is not *Vishnu*.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ आद्यानुमानस्य सिद्धसाधनतापराहतत्वात् अन्त्ययोश्च महदादिकं न स्वतःस्वतन्त्रप्रवृत्तिमत् अचेतनत्वात् चेतनसृष्टं वा कार्यत्वात् धटवदित्यादिना सत्प्रतिपक्षत्वात् । “एतस्य वा अक्षरस्य प्रशासने गार्गि प्राच्योऽन्या नद्यः स्यन्दन्ते” (बृ. ५-८-९), “एतेन ह वाव पयो मण्डं भवति” इति “न ऋते त्वत्क्रियते” (ऋ. १०-११ २-९) इत्यादिश्रुतिभिः अंब्वादावपि चेतनप्रवृत्ति-दृष्ट्या साध्यवैकल्याच्च दुष्टत्वेन केवलाचेतनकर्तृत्वस्यप्रामाणिकत्वात् प्रमाणविरुद्धत्वाच्च । तत्प्रतिपादकसमयस्य दुष्टतया तद्विरोधस्याकिञ्चित्क-रत्वात् श्रुतिसमन्वयेनोक्तं विष्णोर्विश्वकर्तृत्वं युक्तमिति । फलं तु अत्र सर्वत्र जन्मादिसूत्रोक्तकर्तृत्वाक्षेपसमाधी॥१॥

The first maxim that infers on the existence of some creator is well accepted. However the second one that implies *pradhaana* as the creator or as the self transformer resulting in the formation of the universe are opposed by counter maxims viz.

- The initial raw material like *mahat* is not an independent creator since it is *Jada* (an inert object) , like clay, stone etc.

The initial raw material like *mahat* must have been created by a *chetana* since it is a creation, like the pot etc.

The counter arguments are also backed by the vedic statement that the rivers flow in the specific direction under the orders of *Vishnu* (as otherwise what could be the reason for the rivers descending

from mountains not to flow in any other direction – even the other directions had the gradient path with reference to the height of the mountain) and that *Vishnu* causes the transformation of milk into curds etc.

Thus the philosophy that propounds the inert matter as the creator of the universe is faulty and hence cannot oppose the concept of *Vishnu* being the creator.

॥ ॐ अन्यत्राभावाच्च न तृणादिवत् ॐ ॥ २ ॥

Anyatraabhaavaaccha na trinaadivat - 2

अनीश्वरसाङ्ख्यमतस्य वैदिकवादं प्रति अत्यन्तविरोधित्वात् अत्र आदौ तन्निरस्य अत्र ईशगुणकप्रधानकर्तृत्वपरसाङ्ख्यमतं निरस्यत इति सङ्गतिः । विष्णोः स्वातन्त्र्येण कर्तृत्वं युक्तं न वेति सन्देहः । न युक्तमिति पूर्वः पक्षः ॥ केवलस्याचेतनप्रधानस्य परिणामाद्ययोगेऽपि गुणभूतेशानुगृहीतस्य तस्य पर्जन्यानुगृहीतपृथिव्यादेस्तृणाद्यात्मनेव महदात्मना परिणामोपपत्तेः प्रागुक्तश्रुतीनां गुणभूतेशपरत्वेन तदविरोधाच्चेत्येवंरूपसाङ्ख्यमतविरोधादिति ॥

The faction of *Saankhya* philosophy that does not believe in the existence of God is a stronger opponent vis-a-vis the other faction which believes in his existence, on the aspect of *Vishnu* being the creator of the universe. Hence after discarding the said philosophy in the first instance, the other faction that believes in *jada* being the creator with the assistance of God is critically examined here.

The way earth cannot do anything on its own, but transforms itself into grass etc with the assistance of rain, the inert matter also creates / transforms into universe when it is supported by God. Hence the creator of universe is the inert matter while God stands only in its support and not as its creator.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ “यच्च किञ्चिज्जगत्सर्वम्” इत्यादिश्रुतौ (महाना.उ.) सर्ववस्तूनां सत्तादिप्रदानाय सर्वगतत्वोक्तेः ईशप्रेरणां विना कस्यापि वस्तुनः सत्त्वस्यैवाभावात् । “स एव भूयो निजवीर्यचोदितां” (भाग. १-१०-२३) इत्यादिस्मृतौ प्रकृत्यादिकारणसत्तादेरपि ईशायत्तत्वोक्तेः ईशः पर्जन्यवन्नानुग्राहकमात्रं कार्यकारणाख्यसर्ववस्तुसत्त्वादिप्रदत्वात् य एवं स एवं यथा सम्मतवत् इति तस्य स्वातन्त्र्यसिद्धेश्चापि साङ्ग्यमतस्य दुर्मतत्वेन तद्विरोधस्याकिञ्चित्करत्वात् युक्तं तस्यैव स्वातन्त्र्येण जगत्कर्तुंत्वमिति ॥ २ ॥

Maha Narayana Upanishat says that *Vishnu* enters every thing with no exception and steers them through their tasks. Hence, it can never be true that the inert matter, whose very existence and qualities are under the regulation of *Vishnu*, is the independent creator. Hence *Vishnu* cannot be considered a mere assistant in the creation of universe.

॥ ॐ अभ्युपगमेऽप्यर्थाभावात् ॐ ॥ ३ ॥

Abhyupagame-apyartha-abhaavaat - 3

अत्र प्राक् श्रुत्यनुमानाभ्यां केवलस्य ईशगुणकस्य वा जडस्य कर्तृत्वनिरासोऽयुक्तः । तयोः अमानत्वाद्देहस्यैव कर्तृत्वोपपत्तेरीशो न कर्तृत्याक्षेपात्सङ्गतिः । विष्णोर्जगत्कर्तृत्वं युक्तं न वेति सन्देहः । न युक्तमिति पूर्वः पक्षः ॥ विनापीशं पूर्वपूर्वस्मादुत्तरोत्तरोत्पादसम्भवात् क्वचित्स्वभावादेव मदिरौत्पत्तिवत् कार्योत्पत्युपपत्तेश्च । प्रत्यक्षेतरप्रामाण्याभावेन प्रागुक्तश्रुत्यनुमानविरोधाभावात् धर्माधर्माद्यदृष्टवस्तुनः अनभ्युपगमेन श्रुत्याद्यप्रामाण्ये धर्माद्यभावः स्यात् इत्यस्येष्टत्वात्, कुतः ईशः कुतस्तारां तत्कर्तृत्वं कुतस्तमाञ्च स्वातन्त्र्यमिति चार्वाकमतविरोधादिति ॥

In this chapter, the validity of *Charvaaka* philosophy is examined. They say that the argument, adduced in discarding the earlier philosophies that *jada* either independently or in association with *Vishnu* is the creator of universe, is based on *sruti* (veda) and

anumaana (logic). Both of these are not accepted as authentic by *Charvaakas*. It is only the physical body that does the tasks. It is seen that the progeny is created by all with nothing like God intervening or supporting the task. In some cases like grape juice transforming into wine, it is just a natural process. Hence there is no sense in accepting God as the universal creator.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ अक्षान्याप्रामाण्येनादृष्टवस्त्वभावे चार्वाकशास्त्रस्य अदृष्टविषयस्य अभावात् दृष्टस्य चाप्राप्तेः, तस्य च दृष्टस्य "अप्राप्ते शास्त्रमर्थवत्" इति न्यायेन विषयत्वायोगात् धर्माद्यभावस्य च अक्षायोग्यत्वात् धर्मादिकं नास्ति प्रत्यक्षेणानुपलम्भात् इत्यनुमानस्य त्वया प्रामाण्यानभ्युपगमाच्च । धर्माधर्माद्य-भावबोधनोपायाभावेन तस्यापि विषयत्वायोगात् तथऽदृष्टस्य धर्मस्वर्गापवर्गादेः प्रयोजनस्याभावात् । दृष्टस्य धनादेः वार्ताद्युपायान्तरसाध्यत्वाद्धर्माद्यभावज्ञाने परधनवनिताद्यर्थं परस्परहिंसादिना अपकारस्यैव प्राप्या धर्माद्यभावबोधनद्वारा लोकोपकारः फलमित्यस्याप्यभावात् विषयप्रयोजनयोरभावेन तन्मतस्य दुष्टत्वात् तयोरभावेऽपि शास्त्रत्वमस्त्वित्यस्य च व्याहतत्वेन तदीयदुर्मत-विरोधस्य अकिञ्चित्करत्वात् युक्तं विष्णोः कर्तृत्वमिति ॥ ३ ॥

The *Charvaaka* philosophy does not believe in any tool other than perception for knowing the authenticity of anything. Hence, nothing that is non-perceivable exists. Thus the subject of this philosophy cannot be anything imperceivable. This does not teach even the perceivable. Hence there is no subject. There is a rule that a philosophy can be of any sense only when it teaches what is not known. *Charvaaka* philosophy has no unknown thing as its subject. They do not have a tool to deny the existence of *dharma* and *adharma* etc. They cannot be negated using perception since they are not perceivable. They cannot use *anumaana* "*dharma* etc do not exist, since they cannot be perceived", for they do not recognize *anumaana* as a tool. Thus, their philosophy cannot boast of having "negating *dharma* etc" as its subject.

Their philosophy does not have a benefit as well. The unseen *dharma*, *swarga*, *moksha* etc cannot be the benefit. The seen aspects like money etc can be achieved through trade etc and hence philosophy finds no place in that. On the contrary, this philosophy leads to causing harm to others through snatching away others money and women.

If it is said that this philosophy helps people in avoiding unnecessary trouble of following the religious practices, how does “help” benefit anyone? In the absence of virtues that “help” can bring, it is just a non-sense.

Thus, the philosophy of *charvaaka* has neither a subject nor a benefit and is just a junk; unworthy to be counted as a philosophy and hence cannot cause any objection to the concept of *Vishnu* being the all-creator.

॥ ॐ पुरुषाश्मवदिति चेत्तथापि ॐ ॥ ४ ॥

Purusha-ashmavaditi chet tathaapi - 4

॥ ॐ अङ्गित्वानुपपत्तेः ॐ ॥

angitva-anupapatteh;

अत्र यदुक्तं प्राग्विषयादिशून्यतया दुर्मतस्याविरोधकत्वादीशः कर्तेति तन्न । विषयादिमत्पुरुषोपसर्जनसांख्यमतविरोधादित्याक्षेपात्सङ्गतिः । विष्णोर्विश्वकर्तृत्वं युक्तं न वेति सन्देहः । न युक्तमिति पूर्वः पक्षः ॥ केवलजडस्य स्वतः प्रवृत्ति-मत्त्वरूपकर्तृत्वस्यानुपपत्तावपि लोके जीवसम्बन्धेन देहस्यैव अश्मानयनादौ प्रवृत्तिदर्शनेन विमता प्रवृत्तिः जीवोपसर्जनाचेतननिर्वृत्ता प्रवृत्तित्वात् अश्मानयनप्रवृत्तिवदित्यनुमानेन जीवगुणकप्रधानस्य कर्तृत्वस्वीकारे बाधकाभावादिति पुरुषोपसर्जनप्रधानकर्तृसांख्यमतविरोधादिति ॥

It is said in the previous chapter that in view of non-existence of a subject and benefit, the other philosophy is bad and hence cannot cause any objection to *Vishnu* being the creator of the universe. This is not true. There is an objection from *saankhya* philosophy that believes in the existence of God but says it is only the *jada* that causes the universe albeit with the association of *chetana*. Hence the sequence of objection.

Whether it is proper to consider *Vishnu* as the creator or not is the question. *Poorvapaksha* says it is not proper. For, though *jada* alone could not act on its own for causing creation, it is seen in the world that the inert body does the tasks like brining the stones when associated with *jeeva*. This can be proved through *anumaana* as well - "The task under discussion (creation) is dispensed by the *jada* associated with *jeeva*, since it is a task, like the task of bringing a stone". Thus in view of there being no hurdle in accepting *jada* associated with *jeeva* as a creator, the earlier conclusion that *Vishnu* is the creator has an objection from this *saankhya* philosophy.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ "न ऋते त्वत्क्रियते किञ्चनारे" इत्यादिप्रागुक्तश्रुत्या शरीर-
प्रवृत्तेरपि ईशाधीनत्वसिद्ध्या जीवस्य गुणत्वे, देहस्य अङ्गत्वेन जीवस्यांगित्वेन
च व्यवहारस्य, लौकिकपरीक्षकसिद्धस्यायोगेन च जीवगुणकदेहात्ममात्रकर्तृत्वा-
भावेन दृष्टान्तस्य साध्यवैकल्येनानुमानस्य दुष्टतया जीवगुणकप्रधानकर्तृत्वस्य
अप्रामाणिकत्वात् । तादृशार्थवेदकस्यापि दुर्मततया उक्तार्थाविरोधकत्वात् युक्तं
विष्णोः कर्तृत्वमिति ॥ ४ ॥

Sankhya philosophy believes in *Vedas*. Hence a vedic text "nothing moves without you (*Vishnu*)" is quoted to discard the concept of *jada* being a creator. The actions by the body are also controlled by God. We see in the world people considering *jeeva* as the primary object and body being his associate not the way this philosophy presents *jeeva* as secondary to the inert body. Hence the *anumaana*

has the defect of the illustration being without *saadhya*, the thing to be proved.

Hence this philosophy being defective cannot oppose the concept of *Vishnu* being the universal creator.

॥ ॐ अन्यथानुमितौ च ज्ञशक्तिवियोगात् ॐ ॥ ५ ॥

Anyatha-anumitau cha jna-shakti-viyogaat - 5

॥ ॐ विप्रतिषेधाच्चासमञ्जसम् ॐ ॥

vipratishedhaaccha-asamanjasam;

अत्र जीवस्यैवाङ्गित्वोपगमेन अङ्गत्वानुपपत्तिदोषो नेतिशङ्कनात्सङ्गतिः । विष्णोः कर्तृत्वं युक्तं न वेति सन्देहः । न युक्तमिति पूर्वः पक्षः ॥ प्रागुक्तदिशा अश्मानयनादौ देहोपसर्जनजीवकर्तृत्वदृष्ट्या तदृष्टान्तेन विमता प्रधानप्रवृत्तिः अचेतनोपसर्जनजीवाधीना प्रवृत्तित्वात् अश्मानयनादिप्रवृत्तिवत् इत्यनुमानेन पुरुषप्रधानकस्य प्रधानस्यैव स्वतःप्रवृत्तौ ईशेन कृत्याभावात् दूरे कर्तृत्वम् । प्रागुक्तश्रुतेश्च युक्तिविरोधेन अवज्ञानादिति पुरुषप्रधानकसाङ्ख्यमतविरोधादिति ॥

This chapter deals with another section of *saankhyas* who present *jeeva* as the primary entity that does the tasks in association with the *jada* body. The following *anumaana* evidences the fact of *jeeva* being the creator of universe – logic “Universal creation is done by *jeeva* in association with *jada* body since it is an action, like an action of lifting a stone”. Thus there is no purpose in accepting God as the creator. Since the vedic texts adducing *Vishnu* as the creator has an objection from the aforesaid *anumaana*, the said texts are to be treated as unauthentic.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ एवं पूर्वमतादन्यथानुमानेऽपि जीवस्य देहं विनापि प्रवृत्तौ शक्तत्वे देहवैयर्थ्यादिशक्तत्वे देहसम्बन्धार्थप्रवृत्तावपि केवलस्य शक्त्यभावेन

अङ्गित्वानुपपत्तेः । प्रकृतिसम्बन्धस्य तत्र शक्तत्वोक्तौ प्रकृतिसम्बन्धप्रवृत्तावपि एवमित्यनवस्थानात् । अनादित्वेन तत्परिहारे मुक्तप्रवृत्तेः सर्वथाऽयोगेन स्वतन्त्रेणेशेनैव देहसम्बन्धे घटनीये अश्मानयनादिप्रवृत्तावपि तथेति दृष्टान्तस्य साध्यहीनत्वेन अनुमानस्य दृष्टतया उक्तार्थस्य साधकाभावेन अप्रामाणिकत्वात् स्वतन्त्रेशाङ्गीकारे च सर्वसामञ्जस्यात् युक्तं विष्णोः कर्तृत्वमिति ॥ इतरेत्यत्र श्रुतियुक्तिप्राप्तस्य अत्र तु समयप्राप्तस्य जीवकर्तृत्वस्य निरास इति भेदः ॥ ५ ॥

Even after interchanging the primary and secondary from what was told by the earlier sect of *saankhyas*, it remains the fact that *jeeva* cannot do anything without a body. Obtaining a body is also an action. Whether this action was done while having a body or when he had no body? If he could have done this action without a body, why not all other actions? If he has done with some earlier body, whether securing that earlier body was, while having some other body or without it? If without it, then why not all other actions. If he had a third body at that time, the query continues with no end.

If one material body is agreed to exist eternally with *jeeva*, what would happen in *moksha* when all material aspects are shred? It is amply explained in *Vedas* that one who has attained *moksha* will engage in lot of voluntary activities. How would they be possible without a body?

Since *jeeva* is not capable of acquiring a body on his own, if it is to be accepted that God provides the body, then on the same logic, it is true that God only facilitates every action. Even the example of picking up a stone is defective in that it is also enabled by God and not done by *jeeva* independently. Hence this defective philosophy cannot oppose the concept of *Vishnu* being the all-creator.

॥ ॐ महदीर्घवद्वा ह्रस्वपरिमण्डलाभ्याम् ॐ ॥ ६ ॥

mahad-deergha-vadva hrasva-parimandala-abhyaam- 6

॥ ॐ उभयथापि न कर्मातस्तदभावः ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ समवायाभ्युपगमाच्च
 साम्यादनवस्थितेः ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ नित्यमेव च भावात् ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ रूपादिमत्वाच्च
 विपर्ययो दर्शनात् ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ उभयथा च दोषात् ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ
 अपरिग्रहाच्चात्यन्तमनपेक्षा ॐ ॥

*ubhayathaapi na karma-atastadabhaavah; samavaaya-abhyupagamaaccha
 saamyad-anavasthiteh; nityameva cha bhaavat; roopaadimatvaaccha
 viparyayo darshanaat; ubhayathaa cha doshaat; aparigrahaaccha-
 atyantam-anapeksha;*

अत्र निरीश्वरपक्षोक्तो दोषो नेशवादिनां मत इति पूर्ववैषम्येण शङ्कनात्सङ्गतिः ।
 अत्र प्रागुक्तं विष्णोरनन्तगुणत्वं युक्तं न वेति सन्देहः । न युक्तमिति प्राप्तम् ।
 ईश्वरात्मनोः द्रव्यत्वेन संख्यापरिमाणपृथक्त्वसंयोगविभागाख्यानां पञ्चानां
 सामान्यगुणानां कर्तृत्वोपयोगितया ज्ञानेच्छाप्रयत्नानां त्रयाणां विशेषगुणानामा-
 वश्यकत्वेन अष्टगुणातिरिक्तगुणे मानाभावेन जीवात्मवच्चतुर्दशगुणवत्त्वस्याप्यभावेन
 अनन्तगुणत्वं दूरतोऽपास्तमिति वैशेषिकमतविरोधादिति ॥

This chapter deals with the thoughts of another sect of *saankhyaas* who believe in the existence of God.

Since both God and *jeeva* are *dravyas* [All things are classified as *dravya* (matter), *guna* (attributes), *karma* (action), *saamanya* (the commonness amongst things), *vishesha* (uniqueness), *samavaaya* (the relationship between the cause and effect, between *dravya* and *guna* etc) and *abhava* (the absence)], they both have five generic qualities of *sankhya* (count), *parimaana* (size), *prithaktva* (identity), *samyoga* (cohesiveness) and *vibhaaga* (divisiveness). This apart, they have three other qualities that are essential for anyone who is a doer viz. *jnaana* (knowledge), *iccha* (desire) and *prayatna* (effort). *Jeeva* has 6 more qualities of *samskaara*, *sukha*, *dukha*, *dvesha*, *dharma* and *adharma*. Thus God has only eight qualities and there is no evidence of him having any other quality.

When he does not have even 14 qualities, how can it be that he has innumerable ones?

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ वैशेषिकाणां अयुक्तभाषित्वेन अप्रामाणिकप्रक्रियाबोधकस्य तन्मतस्योक्तार्थविरोधित्वात् युक्तमनन्तगुणत्वमिति । तथाहि । यदुक्तं त्र्यणुकादिपरिमाणं चतुरणुकादिपरिमाणासमवायिकारणं, परमाणुद्व्यणुकपरिमाणे तु न भवतः किंतु तद्वत्तद्वित्वत्रित्वसङ्ख्यैवेति । तदयुक्तम् । त्र्यणुकादिगतस्येव परमाण्वादिगतस्यापि परिमाणस्य तथात्वोपपत्तेः । त्र्यणुकगतस्य ह्रस्वत्वेन परमाणुगतस्य च अणुत्येन वैजात्येऽपि सङ्ख्याया इव प्रचयस्यैव हेतुत्वोपपत्तेः । अणु महद्दीर्घं ह्रस्वं चेत्येवं परिमाणावान्तरजातौ मानाभावेन सर्वस्यापि वस्तुनः आपेक्षिकाणुत्वमहत्त्वयोः पुरुषविशेषं प्रति प्रत्यक्षत्वाप्रत्यक्षत्वयोश्च युक्ततया अतिप्रसङ्गाभावाच्च । एवं विवक्षिततन्तुसंयोगभिन्नपटाप्रतीत्या तं प्रति तन्तुसंयोगस्याहेतुत्वेन असमवायिकारणप्रक्रिया न युक्ता । तथा निमित्तकारणत्वेनाङ्गीकृतेश्चेच्छायाः नित्यत्वे प्रलये तस्यां सत्यामपि परमाणुचेष्टाभावेन व्यभिचारादन्यदापि तदभावापत्या त्र्यणुकादिकार्याभावः स्यात् । अनित्यत्वे तदुत्पत्तौ तदिच्छान्तरापेक्षायां अप्रामाणिकव्यक्तिपरम्परया अनवस्थापातात् । अनपेक्षायां तत्रेव अन्यत्रापि तस्याः हेतुत्वं न स्यादिति तदुपेतं निमित्तकारणमप्ययुक्तम् । तथा गुणगुण्यादेः भिन्नत्वमुपेत्य विशिष्टप्रत्ययाद्यर्थमुपेतस्य समवायस्य समवायिभ्यां भिन्नत्वेन तत्रापि समवेतमिति विशिष्टप्रत्ययार्थं समवायान्तराङ्गीकारे तत्राप्येवमित्यनवस्थापत्या समवायस्यायोगेन यत्समवेतं कार्यमुत्पद्यते तत्समवायिकारणमिति लक्षणयुक्तं समवायिकारणमपि अयुक्तमिति विश्वसृष्टिरयुक्ता । तथा लयोऽपि तन्मते न युक्तः । समवायिकारणपरमाणूनां निमित्तभूतेश्चेच्छादेश्च नित्यत्वे सदा कार्योत्पत्तेरेव अवश्यंभावित्वात् । किंच परमाणवोऽनित्याः रूपादिमत्त्वाद्धटवदिति अनुमानविरुद्धत्वेन परमाणुनित्यत्वस्यापि तन्मतेऽयोगाच्च । अन्यथा घटादेरपि नित्यत्वापत्तेः । भौतिकत्वेन हेतुविशेषणेन सिद्धान्तेऽव्यभिचारात् । अन्वीक्षिकीं तर्कविद्यायामनुरक्तो निरर्थिकाम् इति भारते (शान्तिपर्व १८०-४७) सृगालरूपेन्द्रेण तर्कविद्यानुरागस्य सृगालजन्महेतुत्वोक्त्या निन्दितत्वाच्चेति दुष्टत्वं ध्येयम् । फले तु पूर्वाध्यायोक्तपूर्णगुणत्वाक्षेपसमाधाने ॥ ६ ॥

Since these *vaisheshikas* speak absurd, they pose no threat to the concept of *Vishnu* having innumerable qualities. Their absurdity is explained in terms of one of their concepts as under:

They call the tiny indivisible particles of matter as “*anu*”. During creation two such *anus* join together to form one *dvanuka*. Three *dvyanukas* club together to form *tryanuka* and four *tryanukas* form one *chaturanuka*. Subsequent formations have no such limitations on numbers. According to them, the size of *tryanuka* causes the size of *chaturanuka* since both of them are considered as macro (*mahat*). However, the size of *tryanuka* is not caused by the size of *dvyanuka*, which is of *anu parimaana* (micro size) but by the number. The reasoning is that only similar objects can be the cause and effect. A dog cannot give birth to an elephant. Micro and Macro sizes are classified as of different class and hence there cannot be a cause and effect relationship between them.

The entire of this concept is only a fig of their imagination. There is no evidence in support of this. In fact, there is nothing like an “indivisible” unit of matter. Even a millionth part of an atom is divisible. The classification of micro and macro itself is baseless. They are in fact relative. The statue of Sardar Patel is macro when viewed along the buildings around. However it is micro vis-a-vis the Himalayan mountains.

If a micro size cannot cause a macro size just because they belong to two different classes, how then can a number, which is not even a size can cause a macro size? If the size of a *tryanuka* can cause the size of a *chaturanuka*, on the same logic, the size of *dvyanuka* should also be causing the size of *tryanuka*.

These *vaisheshikas* also say that the physical contact (*samyoga*) of the yarn strings is an indirect cause (*asamavaayi kaarana*) for the formation of cloth. Since there is no cloth without the physical union of the strings, the union itself cannot be considered as a cause for the cloth.

There are three causes viz. *samavaayi* (components), *asamavaayi* (ancillaries like colour, size, contact and so on) and *nimitta* (like the doer, time, place, God's will etc). Let us now examine the validity of *nimitta kaarana* in *vaisheshika* theory. God's will is a *nimitta kaarana*. It exists eternally. The physical matter in the form of *anu* is also eternal. How then that the creation does not happen during *pralaya*, the deluge? When all the requirements for a creation exist, there is no reason the creation not happening. It cannot be said that "time" suitable for creation did not exist. They classify time based on the activities happening and not that time decides the activities. Had God's will not been eternal, then it should be accepted that it also born – meaning, there is a cause even for that. Then, whether that cause is eternal? If yes, then there is no reason for creation not happening. If it is not eternal, then it should have one more cause and such an infinite argument is called *anavastha*, a defect in logic that cannot prove the point.

Similarly, *Vaisheshikas* assign a relationship between matter and their attributes (like colour, odour etc.), the components and their object etc. This relationship is named as "*samavaaya*". If this is true, then there should be one more relationship between *samavaaya* and the matter since they are different. That second relationship is also different from the matter and the first relationship. Hence there should be a third, a fourth and so on infinitely. This is absurd. Hence their concept that the components form the object through their *samavaaya* relationship is also senseless.

Thus the three casues explained by *Vaisheshikas* for the universal creation do not stand the test of reasoning and hence they cannot explain the creation itself. Similar is the case for *laya* – the deluge where the cause exists at all times but it does not happen at all times.

The logic that *anu* is transient since they have colour like other materials we see around, also vitiates their theory of *anu* being eternal.

A statement in *Mahabharata Shantiparva* condemns baseless logic and says that such a logic when professed, has caused someone to take birth as a wolf.

॥ ॐ समुदाय उभयहेतुकेऽपि तदप्राप्तिः ॐ ॥ ७ ॥

Samudaaya ubhaya-hetuke-api tadapraaptih - 7

॥ ॐ इतरेतरप्रत्ययत्वादिति चेन्न उत्पत्तिमात्रनिमित्तत्वात् ॐ ॥ ॐ उत्तरोत्पादे च पूर्वनिरोधात् ॐ ॥ ॐ असति प्रतिज्ञोपरोधो यौगपद्यमन्यथा ॐ ॥ ॐ

प्रतिसङ्ख्याऽप्रतिसङ्ख्यानिरोधाप्राप्तिरविच्छेदात् ॐ ॥ ॐ उभयथा च दोषात् ॐ ॥ ॐ आकाशे चाविशेषात् ॐ ॥ ॐ अनुस्मृतेश्च ॐ ॥

itaretara-pratyatvaaditi chenna utpatti-maatra-nimittatvaat; uttarotpaade cha poorva-nirodhaat; asati pratijno-parodho yougapadyam-anyathaa; pratisankhyaa-apratisankhyaa-nirodha-apraaptir-avichedat; ubhayathaa cha doshaat; aakaashe cha avisheshaat; anusmriteshcha;

एवं परमाण्वारम्भवादनिरासेनोपस्थिततत्पुञ्जवादोऽत्र निरस्यते इति सङ्गतिः । विष्णोर्विश्वकर्तृत्वं युक्तं न वेति सन्देहः । न युक्तमिति प्राप्तम् । रूपविज्ञान-वेदनासंज्ञासंस्काररूपेणावस्थितस्य परमार्थसतः अशेषजगतः परमाणुहेतुक-तत्समुदायमात्रत्वात् तावता घटादिबुद्ध्युपपत्तौ परमाणुपरिमाणस्य तदारब्ध-

स्यावयविनोऽभ्युपगमस्य व्यर्थत्वात् सत्त्वस्य चार्थक्रियाकारित्वरूपत्वेन सतो वस्तुनः स्थायित्वे तेन स्वसत्तादशायां स्वसजातीयघटादिकार्यान्तरजननात् ताभ्यां तथा इत्येकक्षण एवानन्तकार्यापातेन अर्थक्रियाकारित्वरूप-सत्त्वान्यथानुपपत्त्या वा यत्सत्तत्तक्षणिकं यथा दीपादि सन्तश्चामी भावाः इत्यनुमानेन वा क्षणिकत्वात् तस्योक्तकार्यजातस्य कालकर्मनिमित्तेनैव जन्मसम्भवे ईश्वरेण कृत्याभावात् आगमप्रामाण्यानभ्युपगमेन मानाभावाच्चेत्येवंरूपेण वैभाषिकसौत्रान्तिकयोर्मतेन विरुद्धत्वादिति ॥

After disposing off the philosophy of atoms (*anu*) being the cause of universe, it is now time to examine the validity of another philosophy (that of *vaibhaashika* and *soutrantika* sects of Buddhists) that say bunch of atoms have caused the universe.

According to them the entire of universe is classified as *roopa*, *vijnaana*, *vedana*, *samjnaa*, *samskaara*. *Roopa* consists of *anu* (atoms) of all material objects and senses. Unqualified knowledge (*nirvikalpaka jnaanam*) is *vijnaana*. Sorrow and pain form *vedana*. Pleasure is considered as absence of pain and hence even that is sometimes counted as *vedana*. Qualified knowledge (*savikalpaka jnaanam*) is *samjna* – eg. Hairy person, cow is going, Red Roses. Knowledge of these things registered in mind (*vaasana*) is *samskaara*. All these are *satya* (true things) and are nothing but bunches of atoms present in different shapes and sizes. Since only these bunches appear like various objects of book, table etc., there is no sense in considering something as their cause.

A thing to be real, it should be doing some or the other task. Hence it is understood that these atoms keep creating their replica every moment. However, since the objects do not multiply due to such replication, it is evident that each atom creates its own replica every moment and destroys its own self in the same moment resulting in only of them being present at all times. This is like the

flame of a candle. Even though the individual particles are momentary, the flame is seen to be a continuous one.

Since objects are getting created on account of time and actions, there is no room for assumption of the existence of God and of him being the creator of universe. *Vedas* are not considered as valid proof and hence there is no evidence for the existence of God.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ तयोरनुपपन्नभाषितया तन्मतस्य दुष्टत्वेन तद्विरोधस्याहेतुक-
स्याकिञ्चित्करत्वात् युक्तं विष्णोः कर्तृत्वमिति । तथाहि । अणुहेतुकः
अणुसमुदाय एव घटादिः नत्वन्यः अवयवी कश्चिदस्तीति तावदयुक्तम् ।
एकाणुहेतुकस्य एकस्मात्समुदाय इत्यस्य व्याहतेरयोगात्, अनेकाणुहेतुक इति
पक्षेऽपि मिलितानेकाणुहेतुकः सः इत्युक्तौ तु मेलने समुदायः समुदाये सति
मेलनमित्यन्योन्याश्रयात् । विरलानेकहेतुकः स इत्युक्तौ तु तेषां सदा सद्भावेन
समुदायस्यापि सदा सत्त्वापत्त्या तद्विनाशरूपलयाङ्गीकारविरोधात् । अथ मन्यसे
विरलाणुस्थानेकत्वसङ्ख्यायाः समुदायशब्दार्थत्वोपगमात् तस्याश्च सदातनत्वेऽपि
अपेक्षाबुद्धिव्यङ्गत्वेन तत्प्रतीतिव्यवहारयोः इदं चेदं चेत्यपेक्षाबुद्धयधीनत्वात्
तस्याः सामीप्यहेतुकत्वेन लयेऽणूनां सामीप्याभावेन अभावात् तन्निमित्त-
तद्वित्तिव्यवहाराभावेन लयोपपत्तिरिति । तन्न । विषयात्मनोः क्षणिकत्वेन
परमाणुदर्शनापेक्षाबुद्धिसमुदायवित्तिव्यवहाराणां त्रयाणां एकविषयकत्वैकाधिक-
रणत्वयोरयोगेन कदापि समुदाये वित्तिव्यवहारयोरभावापातात् । त्वन्मते अणूनां
सदृशकार्यजननस्वभावत्वाङ्गीकारेण विरलेभ्यो मिलितानूपत्तयेरयोगाच्च ।
क्षणिकत्वपक्षे असति प्रतिज्ञेति प्रतिसंख्येति सूत्राभ्यां उक्तदिशा प्रतिक्रियो-
त्पत्तिविनाशयोरयोगेन क्षणिकत्वस्याप्ययुक्तत्वाच्च । प्रागुक्तार्थापत्तेश्च उभयथा
चेति सूत्रोक्तदिशा दुष्टत्वात् अनुमानस्य च आकाशे चेत्यनेनोक्तदिशा
प्रकरणसमत्वात् तदेवेदमिति प्रत्यभिज्ञाबाधितत्वाच्च क्षणिकत्वस्याप्रामाणिक-
त्वाच्चेति ॥ ७ ॥

Since these people are speaking non sense, their objection to Vishnu being the creator of universe does not hold water. Let us

examine their concepts. They say bunched atoms are the cause of objects. Single atom cannot be considered as bunched atom. Now, to consider an atom as a bunched one, it should be existing in close proximity to others. Without coming closer, an atom cannot be considered as a bunched one and till such time it becomes a bunched one, it cannot come closer, to cause a bunch. Thus, with this defect of *anyonyaashraya* – inter-dependence the concept gets disproved.

If they are to say that it is not bunched atoms but scattered ones that cause the world, the scattered ones exist at all times the objects must be existing even during delusion. That is not true. Nothing exists during delusion. If they were to say that it is the perception caused by the atoms being close to each other, that results in them being viewed as objects and that such proximity does not exist during delusion, even that is not true. In their philosophy, everything is momentary including the person who is seeing and the object that is seen. The person sees an object in one moment, he needs to conceive the object based on the proximity of the atoms in the next moment and should act on it in the third moment. Now, the person in the first moment has changed in the second moment and the second one in the third moment. Similarly, the object has also changed during these three moments. What is seen is not there in the next moment and the person who has seen also changed in the next moment. How then can there be a perception that results in viewing an object as a book, table etc. Moreover, every atom creates its exact replica of itself and places it in its own place and then gets itself destroyed in the same moment. While this being so, how can a scattered atom cause another that is proximal to another? If an atom is to create its own replica in the same moment of its own birth, how can it be considered as its cause? To be a cause, it should exist in the immediate previous moment of its creation.

॥ ॐ नासतोऽदृष्टत्वात् ॐ ॥ ८ ॥

Naasato-adrishtatvaat - 8

॥ ॐ उदासीनानामपि चैवं सिद्धिः ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ नाभाव उपलब्धेः ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ
वैधर्म्याच्च न स्वप्नादिवत् ॐ ॥

*udaaseenaanam-api chaivam siddhih; naabhaava upalabdheh;
vaidharmaaccha na svapnaadivat;*

क्षणिकपरमाणुपुञ्जमतोक्तदोषो नास्माकमिति पूर्वाक्षेपेण प्रवृत्तः सङ्गतिः ।
विष्णोरुक्तं विश्वकर्तृत्वं युक्तं न वेति सन्देहः । न युक्तमिति प्राप्तम् ।
पारमार्थिकात् देशकालवस्तुच्छेदशून्यात् शून्यतत्वादेव संवृतिसम्बन्धेन
विश्वोत्पत्त्युपपत्तौ ईशेन कृत्याभावात् श्रुत्यादेरमानत्वेन तस्याः
अप्रामाणिकत्वाच्चेत्येवंरूपेण शून्यवादिमतेन विरोधात् इति ॥

This chapter deals with the philosophy of that sect of Buddhists that speak of *shoonya*, the void (emptiness) as the cause of universe. This void is considered as something existing (*bhaava*) and not just an absence of everything. This void is spread across time and space with no boundaries and the universe gets created out of this void through the contact of *samvriti*, the ignorance. While this is so, it carries no purpose in imagining the existence of God . There is no evidence as well in support of his existence. Vedas are not considered as authentic and hence they cannot be accepted as evidence. Thus, the philosophy of *Vishnu* being the creator of universe stands opposed by this theory.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ सत्त्वादिसर्वधर्मशून्यस्य सत्त्वायोगेनासत्वादसतः
कारणत्वस्याप्रामाणिकत्वात् । खपुष्पादीनामपि सौरभ्यकार्यहेतुतापत्त्या
अतिप्रसङ्गदुष्टत्वाच्च । शून्यमेव जगदाकारेण भाति न वस्तुतो जगदस्तीत्यस्यापि
सदित्यबाधितप्रत्यक्षादिबाधेनायोगाच्च तन्मतस्य दुष्टतया तद्विरोधाभावात् युक्तं
विष्णोर्विश्वकर्तृत्वमिति ॥ एतेन मायिमतविरोधोऽपि निरस्तो ध्येयः ॥ ८ ॥

If a thing were to exist, it should have some or the other quality – at least a basic quality of “existence” (*satva*). The referred philosophy of Buddhists do not consider any quality (*dharma*) to exist in *shoonya*, the void. Such an object that does not even have an existence cannot cause the universe. Had it been so, even the sky flower should be generating the fragrance. Sky flower is a poetic expression of metaphor equating the sky to a flower. If they were to say that universe is not created by *shoonya* but it is only this *shoonya* that appears as universe, even this is not an acceptable proposition. It is the experience of everyone that the world exists in reality and not just an appearance. Hence this philosophy stands defeated and cannot oppose the concept of *Vishnu* being the universal creator.

॥ ॐ न भावोऽनुपलब्धेः ॐ ॥ १ ॥

na bhaavo anupalabdheh - 9

॥ ॐ क्षणिकत्वाच्च ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ सर्वथानुपपत्तेश्च ॐ ॥

kshanikatvaaccha; sarvatha-anupapatteshcha;

अत्रापि विज्ञानस्य सत्यत्वेन शून्यवैषम्यात् शून्यवादाद्युक्तदोषोऽस्माकं नेति पूर्वाक्षेपात्सङ्गतिः। विष्णोरुक्तं सर्वकर्तृत्वं युक्तं न वेति सन्देहः । न युक्तमिति प्राप्तम् । नित्यनिरञ्जनात् सद्रूपाद्विज्ञानतत्त्वादेव परमार्थतः तदनन्यजगदुदय-सम्भवात् नेशेन कृत्यमित्येवंरूपेण विज्ञानवादिमतेन विरोधादिति ॥

This sect of Buddhists consider that everything in the universe is nothing but knowledge (*vijnaana*). They accept *vijnaana* to be real and existing and hence the objection applicable to *shoonya* philosophy are not valid in this case. This *vijnaana* is eternal, flawless and real. It is from this *vijnaana* the universe is created and hence there is no purpose in accepting the existence of God.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ विज्ञानतत्त्वव्यतिरेकेण जगदेव नास्तीत्यस्य सत्त्वग्राह्यबाधित-
प्रत्यक्षबाधितत्वात् ॥ तत्तादात्म्यस्य चाप्रामाणिकत्वात् । सहोपलम्भनियमाद-
भेदो नीलतद्वियोरित्यनुमानस्य च बाधितभेदप्रतीतिविरुद्धत्वात् विज्ञानस्य
आशुतरविनाशित्वेनातादृशजगत्तादात्म्यायोगाच्च तन्मतस्यायुक्ततया तद्विरोधा-
भावाद्युक्तं विष्णोर्विश्वकर्तृत्वम् ॥ ९ ॥

The concept of non-existence of anything other than knowledge is contrary to the experience of everyone which perceives real and existing objects that are different from knowledge. Knowledge of an object and the object cannot be one and the same. It cannot also be deduced that both are one and the same on account of them being together at all times like the black colour and its knowledge. Both of them are perceived as different only. Knowledge is generated when an object is perceived and it dies out immediately leaving its impression in mind. However the objects stay back.

Thus, even this philosophy is fraught with defects and cannot oppose the concept of *Vishnu* being the creator of universe.

॥ ॐ नैकस्मिन्नसम्भवात् ॐ ॥ १० ॥

Naikasmin-asambhavaat - 11

॥ ॐ एवं चात्माकात्स्न्यम् ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ न च पर्यायादप्यविरोधो विकारादिभ्यः ॐ ॥ ॥

ॐ अन्त्यावस्थितेश्चोभयनित्यत्वादविशेषात् ॐ ॥

*evam cha aatma-akaartsnyam; na cha paryaayaadap-yavirodho
vikaaraadibhya; antyaa-vasthite-shchobhaya-nityatvaad-avisheshaat;*

अत्र शून्यवादाद्युक्तासत्त्वसत्त्वयोरङ्गीकारेण नैकैकपक्षोक्त दोषोऽस्माकां
इत्याक्षेपात् सङ्गतिः । विष्णोरुक्तं विश्वकर्तृत्वं युक्तं न वेति सन्देहः । न युक्तमिति
प्राप्तम् । कायपरिमाणात्मादृष्टात् दृष्टसाधनैश्च सत्त्वं असत्त्वं सदसत्त्वं

सदसद्विलक्षणत्वं सत्त्वे सति सद्विलक्षणत्वं असत्त्वे सति असद्विरक्षणत्वं सदसत्त्वे सति सदसद्विलक्षणत्वं इत्याद्यनियतसप्तभङ्ग्यात्मकस्य जगतो जन्मादि सम्भवात् ईशेन कृत्यं नेत्येवंरूपेण जैनमतेन विरोधादिति ॥

This *sootra* discusses the validity of *Jaina* philosophy that says every other philosophy on the reality or otherwise of the universe is true. They say so in order to avoid being discarded on account of an opposition from such other thoughts. They say that this universe is *sat*, *asat*, *sadasat*, *satve sati sadvilakshanam*, *asatve sati asadvilakshanam* and *sadasatve sati sadasadvilakshanam*. These terms would approximately mean “real, unreal, real and unreal, real but not real, unreal but not unreal, though real and unreal, it is not real and unreal respectively.

Another significant feature of this philosophy is that they say that the size and shape of *jeeva* as equivalent to the body they occupy. How else would *jeeva* obtain experience from the senses? After all, senses need to be in contact with *jeeva* to facilitate getting the information from them, is their argument.

While the universe comprising of the above said materials gets created through the visible / known means, there is no reason to accept the existence of God.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ व्यवस्थितसदसत्त्वभावाभावत्वादिप्रकारद्वयान्यप्रकारस्याप्रा-
माणिकत्वेन असम्भावितत्वात् एकैकपक्षोक्तदोषपरिजिरीर्षया सप्तभङ्ग्यङ्गीकारे
सर्वपक्षोक्तदोषानुषङ्गानिवारणाच्च । मशकमातङ्गादिसूक्ष्मस्थूलदेहप्राप्त्या आत्मनः
तत्र अकात्स्न्यतिरेकयोरापत्तेः । पर्यायेण तत्तत्कायपरिमाणोक्तौ च विकारित्वेन
अनित्यतापत्तेः । आत्मनः कायपरिमाणत्वप्रक्रियायाः अप्रामाणिकत्वाच्च
तन्मतस्य दुष्टत्वाद्युक्तं विष्णोर्विश्वकर्तृत्वमिति ॥ २० ॥

A thing can be real or unreal. All the remaining kinds of status are just contradicting imaginations without any proof of their existence. If all such things are to be accepted just to avoid collusion with other thoughts, acceptance of all would invariably invite the ire of every thought.

If *jeeva* were to have the size of his physical body, what would happen to a *jeeva* presently born as an ant takes birth as an elephant or vice versa? He would either remain in some remote corner of the elephant or stay far beyond the body of the ant. Either way, the concept of size being equivalent to that of the body gets defeated. If *jeeva* were to grow or shrink to fit into the body, it would mean that he is subject to mutation. Anything that mutates, meets an end sooner or later. Thus, it would mean *jeeva* has an end – which is not true even in their philosophy.

Thus, this philosophy that has so many defects in itself cannot pose a threat to the concept of *Vishnu* being the creator of the universe.

॥ ॐ पत्युरसाम्जस्यात् ॐ ॥ ११ ॥

Patyur-asaamanjasyaat - 11

॥ ॐ सम्बन्धानुपपत्तेश्च ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ अधिष्ठानानुपपत्तेश्च ॐ ॥

॥ ॐ करणवच्चेन्न भोगादिभ्यः ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ अन्तवत्वमसर्वज्ञता वा ॐ ॥

*sambandha-anupapatteshcha; adhishthaana-anupapatteshcha;
karanavacchen-na bhogadibhyah; antavatvam-asarvajnataa vaa;*

अत्र विश्वस्यैकप्रकारो ररीकारेण सप्तभङ्गीपक्षोक्तदोषो नास्माकमित्याक्षेपात्सङ्गतिः । विष्णोरुक्तं विश्वकर्तृत्वं युक्तं न वेति सन्देहः । न युक्तमिति प्राप्तम् । श्रुति-स्मृतिभिः सार्वज्ञादिगुणकः पशुपतिरेव मायामुपादानीकृत्य हरिहरिण्यगर्भादि-जगन्निर्माता इत्यवगमात् इत्येवमादिरूपेण शैवादिमतेन विरोधादिति ॥

The *Paashupata* philosophy accepts the world as real and hence has no self contradictions the way earlier philosophy had. However, this considers *Pashupati*, the deity who is also popular as *Rudra* as the creator of the universe but not *Vishnu*. The reason is, many scripts including those of *veda* speak of him to be omniscient and that he creates the universe including *Hari*, *Hiranyagarbha* using the raw material *maaya*. Thus, it opposes the theory of *Vishnu* being the creator of the universe.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ यं कामये तं तमुग्रं कृणोमीत्यादिभाष्योक्तश्रुत्यादिभिः शिवस्य पारतन्त्र्यायवगमात् शिवस्याशरीरतया प्रलये भूतानां विलीनत्वेन सृष्टिकाले पृथिव्याद्यधिष्ठानाभावेन कर्तृत्वायोगात् कारकजातस्यैव साक्षात्प्रयत्नाधिष्ठेयतया देहादिसत्त्वे विनाशित्वस्य दुःखादिभोगस्य चापत्तेश्च । विष्णोश्च श्रुतेस्तु इति श्रुतिनयोक्तदिशा नित्यसर्वविषयविचित्रशक्त्युपेतत्वेन ज्ञानानन्दादिमयदेहवत्त्वेन च कर्तृत्वसंभवात् सर्वश्रुतीनां विष्णौ समन्वयस्योक्ततया शिवादिकर्तृत्वे मानाभावाच्च तन्मतस्य दुष्टत्वाद्युक्तं विष्णोः कर्तृत्वमिति । एतेन तुल्यन्यायतया शाक्तेयसौरस्कान्दगाणापत्यमतान्यपि प्रत्युक्तानि ॥ ११ ॥

Since *paashupatas* believe in *Veda*, their thoughts are examined in the context of vedic scripts. *Veda* quotes goddess *Lakshmi* saying that she has the capability to make any one of her choice as *Rudra* etc and that she is obedient to *Vishnu*. With this, it is clear that *Rudra* is not independent. A person who is not independent cannot be the creator of the entire universe.

During the main deluge everything would have gone. Hence *Shiva* (another name of *Rudra*) would also not possess a body and has no platform on which he could create the universe. One can be a creator only if he has a body that can be used as a tool and a platform on which he can build. Since both of them will not be available to *Rudra* during deluge, he cannot be considered as a creator of the universe. If for any reason, it is accepted that he had

a body. It is imperative that he had pains as well. Wherever a body exists, pain follows it. A person who is himself in pain cannot create the universe.

Well these objections do not apply to *Vishnu* because the vedic and other scripts speak of a non-material body that is comprised of *jnaana* and *ananda* existing for him eternally. The rule that pain accompanies the body is only with reference to material bodies and not for those made of *jnaana* and *aananda*.

॥ ॐ उत्पत्यसम्भवात् ॐ ॥ १२ ॥

Upapaty-asambhavaat - 12

॥ ॐ न च कर्तुः करणम् ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ विज्ञानादिभावे वा तदप्रतिषेधः ॐ ॥ ॥
ॐ विप्रतिषेधाच्च ॐ ॥

*na cha kartuh karanam; vijnaanaadi-bhaave vaa tadapratishedhah;
vipratishedhaaccha;*

प्राङ्-निराकृतमपि शक्तिमतं विशेषदोषेण अत्र पुनर्निरस्यत इति सङ्गतिः । विष्णोरुक्तं विश्वकर्तृत्वं युक्तं न वेति सन्देहः । नयुक्तमिति प्राप्तम् । श्रुत्यादौ सार्वज्ञादिगुणशालिन्याः शक्तेरेव विश्वकर्तृत्वश्रवणात् इत्येवंरूपशक्तिमतेन विरोधादिति ॥

With the discarding of *paashupata* philosophy, all similar philosophies propounding *Ganesha*, *Soorya* etc as creators of the universe got discarded. However the one that says *Shakti* (other name for goddess *Paarvati*) as the universal creator is separately examined in view of some special defects in it. Since many scripts say that *Shakti* has created the universe, she should be accepted as the creator. Hence it is not *Vishnu*.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ पुरुषाननुगृहीतस्त्रीमात्रादपत्योत्पत्तेरयोगेन केवलायाः शक्तेः
 ब्रह्मादिविश्वहेतुत्वायोगात्, शिवानुगृहीता सा जगज्जनयित्रीति मध्यमवाममतेऽपि
 तस्योत्पत्युपयोगिज्ञानादिसाधनाभावेन अनुग्राहकत्वायोगात्, ज्ञानादिकं
 तस्योपेयत इति अणुवाममतस्यापि तादृशशिवेनैव विश्वोत्पत्तौ शक्त्युपगमस्य
 वैयर्थ्येन मतत्रयस्यापि श्रुत्यादिना विप्रतिषिद्धत्वाच्च अयुक्तत्वाद्युक्तं विष्णोः
 विशकर्तृत्वमिति ॥ १२ ॥

A female cannot create her off springs without the participation of a male. Hence, it is not true that *shakti*, being a female has created *Brahma* etc. If it is to be said that her consort *Shiva* did associate with her in creation, the question now is whether he had the requisite knowledge and capability to cause the world. If he did not, he cannot be considered as a valid support. If he had, why then that he did not create the universe himself?

With such defects, this philosophy cannot oppose the one that propounds *Vishnu* as the universal creator.

॥ इति श्रीराधवन्द्रयतिकृतायां न्यायमुक्तावल्यां द्वितीयाध्यायस्य द्वितीयः पादः

द्वितीयाध्याये तृतीयः पादः

अत्र पादे पूर्वोक्तदिशा वा विप्रतिषेधादित्युक्तदोषो वैदिकमतेऽपि स्यादित्याशंकानिरासाद्वा पूर्वपादेन संगतिः।

This section continues with the previous one by dispelling the objections in the ascending order of their strength as mentioned at the beginning of this division and also on the applicability of the same as were posed to other philosophies in the fifth chapter of the previous section (under the sootra “om vipratishedaccha asamanjasam om”).

॥ ॐ न वियदश्रुतेः ॐ ॥ १ ॥

na viyad-ashruteh - 1

॥ ॐ अस्ति तु ॥ ॥ ॐ गौण्यसम्भवात् ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ शब्दाच्च ॐ ॥
॥ ॐ स्याचैकस्य ब्रह्मशब्दवत् ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ प्रतिज्ञाहानिरव्यतिरेकाच्छब्देभ्यः
ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ यावद्विकारन्तु विभागो लोकवत् ॥

asti tu; gouny-asambhavaat; shabdaaccha; syaacchaikasya brahma-shabdavat; pratijnaa-haanir-avyatirekaac-chabdebhyah; yaavad-vikaarantu vibhaago lokavat;

अधिभूताधिदैवपरमात्मजीवविचारेषु आदौ सूचीकटाहन्यायेन अधिभूताधिदेव-विचारः क्रियते । अत्र वियत्पदेन भूताकाशौ तदभिमानिनौ चोच्यन्ते । अत्र आकाशः उत्पत्तिमान्नवेति सन्देहः । नोत्पत्तिमानिति प्राप्तम् । वियदनुत्पत्त्य-नुभवेन, वियत् अनुत्पत्तिमत् विभुत्वात्सम्मतवदिति युक्त्या चानुगृहीतत्वेन बहुत्वेन च प्रबलया “अनादिर्वायमाकाश” इत्याद्यनादित्वश्रुत्या तत्सिद्धेः । एतद्विरुद्धतया “आकाशस्सम्भूत” इति तदुत्पत्तिश्रुतेरमानत्वेन अनुत्पत्तिश्रुतेः भाक्तत्ववर्णनस्याप्ययोगात् । “न जायते म्रियते” इत्यादौ अनुत्पत्तिवाचिशब्दस्य

मुख्यार्थत्वदृष्ट्या कारणेन विना द्वैरूप्यायोगेन इहापि मुख्यार्थत्वस्य न्याय्यत्वाच्चेति ॥

While this section deals with aspects relating to *adhibhoota*, *adhidaiva*, *paramaatma* and *jeeva* (matter, deities regulating the matter, God and *jeeva* respectively), it handles the simpler things first applying the *soochi kataaha* rule where those that can be removed using the needle are handled first and then those that need an axe.

The word *viyat* used in the *sootra* represents the physical space and also its regulating deity. Whether or not *viyat* has an origin is the subject of discussion. Has anybody seen space being created anew? No. (Removing the clutter though referred to as creation of space in the common parlance, it is nothing but vacating the occupants and not creation of an earlier non-existent space). It is even logically valid to say that space is eternally existent since it is spread everywhere like time. Even Veda says *anaadirvaa ayam aakaashah* – this space has been existing eternally. Since this script is backed by the support of an experience (*pratyaksha*) and logic (*yukti*), it cannot be opposed by another vedic script that says *aakaasha* has been created by *aatma*. It cannot even be said that there are two spaces one of which is born and another has been since eternity. The way a *jeeva* is considered eternal with the expression “*na jaayate na mriyate*” the eternity of space also has to be accepted in the same primary perception. There is no reason to assign any secondary meaning to it.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ वियदुत्पत्तिम् "आत्मन आकाशस्सम्भूतः" (ते.२-१) इत्याद्युत्पत्तिश्रुतेर्बाहुल्यात् । न च श्रुत्यन्तरविरोधः । वियच्छब्दितानां भूताकाशतदभिमानिनो पराधीनविशेषावाप्तिरूपोत्पत्तिसम्भवेन तदुत्पत्तिश्रुतीनां तत्सर्वविषयतया बहुविषयत्वेन वियदुत्पत्तिम् अल्पशक्तित्वात् घटवदित्य-

नुमानसध्रीचीनत्वेन पाबल्यात् । तदन्यथानुपपत्त्या अनादित्वश्रुतेः बाहुल्येऽपि भूते कथमप्ययोगेन अल्पविषयतया दौर्बल्येन भाक्तत्वस्य न्याय्यत्वात्, "प्राणः श्रद्धा आकाशः इति भागशो ह्युत्पद्यन्ते" इति (भाल्लवेय) श्रुतिसिद्धत्वाच्च । एकस्याप्यनुत्पत्तिशब्दस्य विरिञ्चपरब्रह्मणोः ब्रह्मशब्दस्येव "स इदं सर्वमसृजत" इति प्रतिज्ञाविरोधेन च "आत्मा वा इदमेक एव अग्र आसीत्" इत्यादिप्रागुक्तो-त्पत्तिश्रुतिबाहुल्यविरोधेन च कारणेन आकाशब्रह्मणोः मुख्यामुख्यत्वस्य युक्तत्वादिति । एवं प्रकृतिजीवचैतन्यकालवेदमहदहंमनोबुद्ध्यादीनामपि पराधीनविशेषावासिरूपा जनिरुक्ता ध्येया । फले तु कृत्स्नजगत्कर्तृत्वा-क्षेपसमाधी ॥१॥

The sky (space) is not eternal but born. There are many such statements as "*aatmana aakaashah sambhootah*" which mean that space has been created by *aatma*, God.

Birth, in a way would mean begetting something that is thrust by others. Men are born. This is nothing but them getting a new body from another with no option to say yes or no. This is called as *paraadheena-vishesha-avaapti*. Such a birth is available for both the physical space as well as its regulating deity. In view of this interpretation, the script that speaks of creation of space covers all subjects of the word *viyat*, this is more powerful than the one that speaks of eternity only to the physical space. This is also supported by the logic "space has birth, for it has limited strength like an earthen pot. Anything that has limited strength is seen to be born". This apart, the word *viyat* should be construed to mean two types of spaces, the one that exists with no bounds and called *avyaakrita aakaasha* and another *bhootaakaasha*, the environmental space. The word also covers the *abhimaani* deities of the said *avyaakrita* and *bhoota-aakaashas*. Of the four, *bhoota-akaasha* is a created one. The other three are said to be born not because they did not exist earlier, but because they get *paraadheena-vishesha*. The word "born" thus gets two meanings and such an usage is not

uncommon, as in the usage of the name *Brahma* for both *Vishnu* and *Chaturmukha* depending on the context.

On the same lines, even those that are said to be eternally existing viz., *prakriti*, *jeeva*, *kaala* (time), *veda*, *mahat-tatva*, *ahankaara tatva*, *manas tatva*, *buddhi tatva* etc are also considered as born on account of them getting *paraadheena-vishesha*.

॥ ॐ एतेन मातरिश्वा व्याख्यातः ॐ ॥२॥

etena maatarishwaa vyaakhyaatah - 2

अत्राकाशाद्वायुरित्यादिश्रौतक्रमाद्वा पूर्वोक्तन्यायातिदेशाद्वा सङ्गतिः । वायुशब्देन भूततन्मुख्यामुख्याभिमानिनां ग्रहणेऽपि मुख्य एव विवादहेतुसत्त्वात् तन्मात्र एवात्र विचारः । वायुरत्र प्रकरणेऽभिमतपराधीनविशेषावाप्तिरूपोत्पत्तिमान्नवेति सन्देहः । नोत्पत्तिमानिति प्राप्तम् । "तेजोऽब्रान्नान्याकाश इति तान्यनित्यानि वायुर्वाव नित्य" इत्यादिश्रुतेः । न चाकाशानुत्पत्तिश्रुतेरिवास्याः अपि गौणार्थत्वात् न पुनश्चोद्यावकाशः । आकाशवद्वायोरपि जन्मवत्त्वे तेजोऽब्रान्नान्याकाशानामनित्य-त्वोक्तिपूर्वकं वायोर्नित्यत्वोक्तेरयोगात् । न चाकाशादिपदैः भूतानामेवोक्तेः ततो मुख्यवायोः स्वरूपनित्यत्वात् विशिष्य नित्यत्वोक्तिरिति वाच्यम् । भूतमात्रग्रहणे हेतोरभावात् । "तेजोब्रान्नान्याकाश इति तान्यचेतनानि वायूर्वाव चेतनः" इति श्रुतौ विशिष्य चेतनत्वोक्त्या सर्वजीवसाधारणस्वरूपमात्र नित्यत्वायोगाच्च । "कुविदङ्ग" इति (ऋ.७-११-१) मन्त्रोक्तसर्वदेवोपास्यत्वाच्च । "नोदयो न निम्लोच" इति श्रुत वायोरुदयास्तमयशून्यत्वाच्च । वायूर्न जनिमान् परमनित्यत्वात् परमचेतनत्वादीशवदित्यादियुक्तेश्च । एवं नित्यत्वव्याप्या-नेकहेतुमतोऽपि जनिमत्त्वे अनुभवविरोधादिति ॥

This chapter discusses birth of *Vaayu*. There is no dispute in the matter of birth of material *vaayu*, air. However, it is not so in the case of the deity *vaayu* who is said to be ever existing. The question here is whether *Vaayu* has even the kind of birth defined as *paraadheena-vishesha-avaapti*. While explaining the position

of five basic elements, *Veda* says that the other four viz. *tejas*, *aapa*, *prithivi* and *aakaasha* are not eternal but *vaayu* is and that it is a well known fact. The interpretation offered for *aakaasha* in considering the material one as physically born and the others as having acquired a special status does not hold good here. For, this vedic statement clearly isolates *vaayu* from others including *aakaasha* and says he is not born. It cannot even be inferred to say that the quoted vedic script refers to physical matter when it says *tejas* etc are born and the deity is eternal. For, if that be the case, it is same for all *jeevas* and hence what is special to specify *vaayu* as eternal? Another Rigvedic hymn says that all deities who had earlier obtained sacred knowledge from *vaayu*, have met in a secluded place along with Sun and prayed *vaayu*. Another vedic script says that *vaayu* neither rises nor sets. The logic “*vaayu* is not born, for he is super eternal and a superior *chetana* like *Vishnu*” also supports the fact that *vaayu* did not have even the birth in the form of *paraadheena-vishesha-avaapti*.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ वायुर्देहसम्बन्धाख्यपराधीनविशेषावाप्तिरूपजनिमान् प्राणाद्वायुर-
जायतेत्याद्युत्पत्तिश्रुतेः । अल्पशक्तित्वयुक्तेश्च । तादृशजन्मभावश्रवणाच्च ।
ईशवदस्यापि तादृशजनिमत्त्वाभावे द्वयोर्विरुद्धस्वातन्त्र्यापाताच्च । न
चोक्तश्रुत्यादिविरोधः । स्वरूपातिरिक्तज्ञाने नित्यत्वाभिप्रायेण तस्य
सर्वस्योपपत्तेरिति । फले तु प्राग्वत् ॥ २ ॥

Vaayu certainly has the birth in the form of acquisition of a body which in turn means *paraadheena-vishesha-avaapti*. The vedic script that *vaayu* is created by *praana* confirms the same. The logic of limited strength as described in the previous chapter holds good here as well in support of *vaayu*'s birth. Had he not had a birth in the form of acquisition of a body, he would have been equal to God and there cannot be two Gods.

The vedic scripts that distinguish *Vaayu* from others and speak of him being ever existing is in the context of him having all knowledge except of his *swaroopa* at all times unlike others whose knowledge is not eternal.

॥ ॐ असम्भवस्तु सतोऽनुपपत्तेः ॐ ॥ ३ ॥

asambhavastu sato anupapatteh - 3

अत्रासम्भवजन्मनो नभःप्रभृतेर्जनिरिव ईशस्यापि जनिरस्त्विति शङ्कनात्सङ्गतिः। सर्वकर्तृत्वेनोक्तो विष्णुः किं जनिमान्नवेति सन्देहः । जनिमानेवेति प्राप्तम् । "असतः सदजायत" इति असतः सकाशात् (ऋ. १०-७२-२) सच्छब्दिते-शस्य जन्मश्रुतेः । न च "न जायते म्रियते" (का. १-२-१८) इत्याद्यानादित्व-श्रुतिविरोध इति वाच्यम् । अस्याः स्वरूपानादित्वपरत्वेन जनिश्रुतेश्च पराधीन-विशेषावाप्तिपरत्वेन व्यवस्थोपपत्तेः । अन्यथा प्रागुक्तचित्प्रकृत्यादावपि सा न स्यात् देहानादित्वाविशेषादिति ॥

If some sort of a birth is to be attributed to those like space that are known to be eternally existing, why not so for God, who has been described as the creator everything, is the subject of this chapter.

God *Vishnu* is also known by the name *Sat* and veda says "*asatah sat ajaayata* - he is born to *Asat*". Another vedic script "*na jaayate mriyate*", that says that he is neither born nor would die has no contradiction with this. For, it speaks of an absence of birth and death for the core as in the case of *jeevas* and not of a birth or death in the form of *paraadheena-vishesha-avaapti*. If it is not so here, it should be similar even in the case of *chit prakriti* (goddess *Lakshmi*) who also has an eternal body.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ देहानादित्वादिना चित्प्रकृतिसमस्यापि ईशस्य स्वतन्त्रत्वादसतः कारणत्वानुपपत्तेश्च सदजायतेति श्रुतेः "ब्रह्म वा असत् सद्वाव प्राणः" इति श्रुत्याः

वायोरीशजन्यत्वपरत्वात् न पराधीनविशेषावासिरूपोत्पत्तिमान् विष्णुरिति । फले तु कृत्सजगत्कर्तृत्वाक्षेपसमाधी ॥ ३ ॥

There are two individuals whose body is also eternal. They are *Vishnu* and *Chit prakriti – Lakshmi*. However, *Vishnu* is different from *Lakshmi* in that that he is *swatantra*, absolutely independent. Hence, there is no question of him getting something through others – *paraadheena-vishesha*. Now, the vedic script saying that he is born to *asat* is only its misinterpretation. It is nowhere seen that something gets created out of nothing. Hence the word *asat* and *sat* do not mean void and God. Another vedic script says “*brahma vaa asat sadvaava praanah*” - *Brahma* is *asat* and *Praana* is *sat*. Thus, it means that *praana* is born to *Brahma*.

॥ ॐ तेजोऽतस्तथा ह्याह ॐ ॥ ४ ॥

tejo atas-tathaa hyaaha - 4

एवमीशानीशयोरजन्मजन्मसिद्धौ कारणत्वेन चेत्युक्तन्यायेन तेजः प्रभृतेरीश-जन्यत्वे च सिद्धे अन्यत्रान्यस्मादपि जन्मास्य नेत्युच्यत इति सङ्गतिः । तेजोदेवता भूतं च किं ईशादिव वायुदेवतातो वायुभूताच्च जायते उतेशादेवेति सन्देहः । वायोरग्निरिति श्रुतेर्वायोरपीति प्राप्तम् । न च सा वायोर्द्वारमात्रपरेति वाच्यम् । तेन विनापि स्रष्टुं शक्तौ ईशस्य द्वारवैयर्थ्यात् । अशक्तौ तु स्वातन्त्र्येण वायुजत्वस्यापि प्राप्तेः । तत्तेजोऽसृजतेति श्रुतेरपि ईशवायूभयजत्वेष्वपि उपपत्तेः ईशमात्रजत्वपरत्वे चोक्तश्रुतिविरोधेनाप्रामाण्यादिति ॥

After discussing the birth and its absence for everything else and God respectively, it is now time to discuss the apparent contradictions in vedas on the creator of *Tejas* etc.

The question here is whether the physical *tejas* (basic element of energy) and its regulating (*abhimaani*) deity are born only to

Vishnu or are born to *Vaayu* as well. *Veda* says *vaayoragnih* – *Agni* took birth from *Vaayu*. We cannot even say that *Vishnu* created *Agni* through *Vaayu*. For if he has the capability to create *Agni* on his own, why should he do so through *Vaayu*? If not, then his independence becomes questionable. The vedic statement *tat tejo asrijata* – it created *tejas* can be interpreted to mean both *Vishnu* and *Vaayu* as the creator. This contradicts the statement that it is born only to *Vishnu*. Hence, in view of the contradictions, the vedic script should be considered as unauthentic.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ ईशादेव स्वातन्त्र्येण जनिमत्तेजः तत्तेजोऽसृजतेति श्रुतेः । अन्यदनपेक्ष्य स्रष्टुं शक्तस्यापि ईशस्य लीलया वायुशब्दितभूततद्देवताद्वारा तेजोभूततद्देवतासृष्टयुपपत्त्या वायोरग्निरिति श्रुतेः द्वारमात्रपरत्वे बाधकाभावेन तद्विरोधाभावाच्चेति । कारणत्वनये वायुशब्दस्येशे मुख्यत्वेन तेजोभूततद्देवतयोस्तज्जत्वसिद्धावपि तद्वद्वायुतद्देवतातोऽपि तयोर्जन्मेति शङ्कात्र निरस्यत इति भेदः । तदनन्यत्वनये साधनान्तरस्य स्वातन्त्र्यं युक्तिप्राप्तं निरस्तम् । इह तु श्रुतिप्राप्तमिति ध्येयम् । फले तु प्राग्वत् ॥ ४ ॥

Tejas is created by God alone independently. The script *tat tejo asrijata* stands in evidence for this. He has used *Vaayu*, the physical air and its deity by that name, as intermediaries playfully to create the physical *Tejas* (heat / energy) and its deity, but not because he could not have done without them.

Though in *Sootra* (*kaaranatvena cha..1-4-4*), it has been proved that even the names of *Vaayu* etc that are stated as intermediaries in the process of creation also speak of *Vishnu* in their primary sense, the discussion here is based on the doubt whether *tejas* etc are born not just to *Vishnu* but to others as well.

॥ ॐ आपः ॐ ॥५॥

अत्र तेजसोऽनन्तरप्राप्तानामपां जनकविशेषश्चिन्त्यत इति सङ्गतिः। अब्देवता भूतं च किं तेजोभूततद्देवतातोऽपि ईशादिवत् स्वातन्त्र्येणोत्पद्यते अथेशादेवेति सन्देहः। अग्रेरापः इति श्रुतेः तेजोभूततद्देवतातोऽपीति प्राप्तम् । न च "ब्रह्मैवेदमग्र आसीत्तदपोऽसृजत" इति श्रुतिविरोधः । स्वेदस्य घर्मजत्वदृष्ट्या आपस्तेजो-जन्याः अप्त्वात् स्वेदादिवदिति युक्त्या तेजस एव "तद्ध्यापोऽजायन्त" इति श्रुत्या च सध्रीचीनत्वेन बलवत्या प्राचीनश्रुत्या बाधितत्वेन अस्याः अमानत्वादिति ॥

The discussion here is on whether the physical water and its deity are created by / born to physical *tejas* and its deity respectively with the exclusion of God, independently or with the inclusion of him.

Veda says *agneraapah* meaning - fire creates water. It also says at another place that it was only *Brahma* that existed initially and he created water. With the example of sweat getting generated out of heat, it can be logically derived that *tejas* causes water. This is also supported by the vedic statement "it is only from *tejas* that water got created". Hence the script that stated *Brahma* as the creator of water is invalid.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ तदपोऽसृजतेति श्रुतेः तेजोभूततद्देवतास्थेशादेव जन्म । अग्रेरापः इति श्रुतिस्तु "स इदं सर्वमसृजत" "कर्ता सर्वस्य वै विष्णुः" इत्यादिश्रुतिस्मृतिगतसर्वशब्दमुख्यार्थत्वानुरोधात् अन्यस्य स्वतः शक्त्यभावाच्च प्रागुक्तदिशा तत्र स्थित्वा तेनाबादिकं जनयतीति द्वारमात्रपरेति ॥ ५॥

Water and its deity are created by *Brahma* alone. The script *agneraapah* confirms this. This is also supported by multiple other vedic statements like "he created everything" and that of other scripts like "*Vishnu* is the creator of everything". The word "everything" is conspicuous and cannot be ignored. Moreover, none other than *Brahma* has an independent capability to be

considered as an independent creator. Hence it is only *Vishnu* who is the creator and all others are just intermediaries.

॥ ॐ पृथिव्यधिकाररूपशब्दान्तरादिभ्यः ॐ ॥ ६ ॥

prithivy-adhikaara-roopa-shabda-santaraadibhyah - 6

एवमुक्तन्यायेनापि द्वारत्वे सिद्धे कुत्र द्वारतेति विशेषोऽत्र चिन्त्यत इति सङ्गतिः। आपः किं ईशस्यान्नसृष्टौ द्वारमुत पृथिवीसृष्टाविति सन्देहः । "आप ऐक्षन्त" "ता अन्नमसृजन्त" (छां.६-२-४) "अद्भ्यः पृथिवी" इति (तै.२-१) श्रुतिद्वयस्यापि परस्परविरुद्धार्थस्य निरवकाशतया निर्णयायोगेनामानतया न कस्यापि द्वारमिति प्राप्तम् । अन्नश्रुतेः "अद्भयो वा अन्नमुत्पद्यते" "ता अन्नमसृजन्त" (छां.६-२-४) "अद्भयः एव तदन्नाद्यं जायते" (छां.६.२-४) इत्यादिबहुवाक्यानां प्रसिद्धार्थपरत्वरूपगुणलाभेन "यत्र क्व च वर्षति तदेव भूयिष्ठमन्नं भवति (छां. ६-२-४) "अन्नमशितं त्रेधा विधीयते" (छां.८-५-१) इति वर्षजत्वाद्यत्वरूपलिङ्गद्वयानुरोधेन प्रसिद्धान्नपरतया पृथिवीपरत्वायोगात् । ओषधीभ्योऽन्नमिति श्रुतिविरोधापत्त्या पृथिवीपदेनान्नस्य ग्रहणायोगाच्च । उक्तश्रुतिविरोधादेव अपामुभयत्र द्वारत्वमित्यस्याप्ययोगात् । बहुकल्पनापत्त्या च अन्नस्योभाभ्यां जन्मेत्यस्याप्ययोगात् मुख्यार्थत्यागापातेन अद्भयः परम्परया अन्नजन्मेत्यस्याप्ययोगाच्च अमानं श्रुतिद्वयमिति ॥

Thus having confirmed the primary creator as *Vishnu* and that others are only as intermediaries, the topic now is to find out who is the intermediary when the vedic scripts contradict each other in the matter. Whether water is the intermediary in the creation of earth or in the creation of food is the subject of present discussion.

Chaandogya upanishat says "aapa aikshanta, taa annamasrijanta" - water contemplated and then created food. It should be borne in mind here that the creator is not the inert water but its deity. Hence the actions of contemplation and creation fit in well and are

logical. *taittiriya upanishat* says “*adbhyah prithivi*” - water created *prithivi*, the earth.

There are many statements in *Chaandogya upanishat* stating that water created food, food is created out of water etc. This is also physically seen. The said *upanishat* also says wherever it rains, plants, being the primary food grow in abundance. Another statement says the eaten food is segregated into three groups. This confirms that what is referred to by the word “*anna*” is nothing but food and hence it cannot be construed to mean *prithivi* to accomodate the statement “*prithivyaa oshadhayah, oshadheebhyo annam*” - *prithivi* created plants and plants generated food. Multiple assumptions / imaginations need to be adopted for doing so. That is considered as a defect in interpretation. In view of the contradiction, both the contradicting vedic statements are invalid.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ अपौरुषेयत्वेन निर्दोषतया श्रुत्योरप्रामाण्यायोगेन अवश्यमर्थान्तरस्य वाच्यत्वात् । ता अन्नमसृजन्तेति श्रुतेः पूर्वत्र “तत्तेजोऽसृजत” इति “तदपोऽसृजत” इत्युत्तरत्र च “तासां त्रिवृतं त्रिवृतम्” इति श्रवणेन अस्य भूतप्रकरणत्वात् । “यत्कृष्णं तदन्नस्य इति कृष्णरूपश्रवणात् । तस्य च “कृष्णैव पृथिवी स्वतः” इति (व्योमसंहिता) स्मृत्या पृथिवीलिङ्गत्वात् । लिङ्गप्रकरणाभ्यां “आपश्च पृथिवी चान्नम्” इति (ऐ.२-३-१) श्रौतप्रयोगेण च अन्नशब्दस्य पृथिवीपरत्वात् । “यत्र क्व च वर्षति” (छां.८-२-४) इत्यादिवाक्यद्वयस्थान्न-शब्दस्य पृथिवीवाचकस्याप्यन्यार्थानुपपत्त्या लक्षणया “तेजोऽशितं” (छां. ८-५-३) इत्यादौ तैजसपरत्ववत् पार्थिव परत्वोपपत्त्या लिङ्गविरोधाभावात् । अपां पृथिवीजन्मन्येव द्वारत्वमिति ॥ फले तु वस्त्वन्तरद्वारा साक्षात्सर्वकारणत्वस्या-क्षेपसमाधी ॥६॥

Nothing in *Veda* is invalid, for it is *apourusheya* – not written by any one. This means, the root cause of defect itself does not exist in it. Hence the contradiction has to be resolved through proper interpretation. The expression “*taa annam asrijanta*” is preceded

by statements “*tat tejo asrijata*”, “*tadapo asrijata*” and is succeeded by “*taasaam trivritam trivritam*”. This clearly indicates that the context is of the creation of the initial basic elements (*pancha bhoota* - *prithivi*, *apa*, *tejas*, *vaayu* and *aakaasha*) at the time of creation of universe and not of water or food seen around.

Anna is explained as the one that contains excessive black (carbon) and this quality is specific to *prithivi*. Hence *anna* and *prithivi* are no different. Even *Aithareya upanishat* says “*aapascha prithivi cha annam*” - *Anna* is nothing but water and *prithivi*. Thus there is contradiction in stating that water causes *anna* or water causes *prithivi*.

The statement that eaten *annam* is divided in to three parts hinders acceptance of this meaning that both *anna* and *prithivi* speak of the same element of *prithivi*. Here it needs to be interpreted that the word *annam* denoting food is a product / derivative of *annam*, *prithivi*. A usage of the kind is found in *Chandogya Upanishat* where it states the eaten *tejas*. Since *tejas* cannot be eaten, it is meant as the derivatives of *tejas* there.

Hence it is concluded that water is an intermediary in the birth of *prithivi* alone and not its subsequent derivative *anna*.

॥ ॐ तदभिध्यानादेव तु तल्लिङ्गात्सः ॐ ॥ ७ ॥

tadabhi-dhyaanaadeva tu tallingaah-sah - 7

एवमधिभूताधिदैवजन्मश्रुत्यविरोधमुक्त्वा तल्लयश्रुत्यविरोधमत्र वक्तीति सङ्गतिः। प्रस्तुतवियदाद्यधिभूताधिदेवानि जनिमत्त्वेन लीयन्त इति सिद्धौ तल्लयकर्ता किं रुद्रो विष्णुर्वेति सन्देहः । रुद्र एवेति प्राप्तं, संहर्तृत्वेनैतस्यैव सुप्रसिद्धेः । “रुद्रो मा विशान्तक” इति (महाना.उ.) श्रुतौ अन्तकपदेन तस्य संहर्तृत्वोक्तेश्च । “यत्प्रयन्त्यभिसंविशन्ति” (ते.३-१) “यमप्येति भुवनं साम्पराये” इत्यादि

विष्णुसंहर्तृत्वश्रुतेस्तु विष्णुः न मारकः जनकत्वात् रक्षकत्वात् पित्रादिवदित्यादियुक्तिसहायरुद्रसंहर्तृत्वश्रुतिविरोधात् अप्रामाण्यात् । अत एव रुद्रस्य संहारद्वारत्वमपि अयुक्तमिति ॥

After resolving the conflict in the matter of birth of *adhibhoota* and *adhidaiva* items, it is now time to resolve the conflict in their *laya* dissolution. Everything that is born has to die. Now, the question here is who causes the death / disintegration of these *bhootas* and their deities – is it *Rudra* or *Vishnu*?. *Rudra* is known to be a destructor and *Mahanaarayana Upanishat* says “O! *Rudra*, do not enter me as a destroyer”. However *taittireeya Upanishat* says everything ultimately enters *Vishnu* during deluge and even in *moksha*, they discard their eternal external bodies and happily enter *Vishnu*. The proposition that *Vishnu* is the destroyer has a problem. Since he is the creator and the guardian, he cannot be the destroyer. Have we seen fathers killing their offspring? Hence, it should be accepted that *Rudra* is the universal destroyer. For the same reason, even accepting *Rudra* as only the intermediary is also not proper.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ विष्णुरेव सर्वलयकर्ता "तस्याभिध्यानात्" इति (श्वे. १-१०) श्रुतावनादिबन्धलयस्य विष्ण्विच्छाधीनत्वोक्त्या सादिविश्वलयः तदधीन इत्यस्य कैमुत्यसिद्धत्वात् । "यमप्येति भुवनं साम्पराये स नो हरिः" "य इदं सर्वं विलापयति स हरिः" "स्रष्टा पाता च संहर्ता स एको हरिः" इत्यादिश्रुतिस्मृतिषु विष्णुसंहर्तृत्वस्य स्पष्टं प्रतीतेश्च । रुद्रसंहर्तृत्वश्रुतिः "निमित्तमात्रमीशस्य" (भाग. १०-७९-१) इत्यादिस्मृत्या कतिपयसंहारे रुद्रस्य द्वारत्वपरा । युक्तिस्तु पित्रादेरमारकत्वस्य ममतादोषप्रयुक्ततया पितृत्वादिप्रयुक्तत्वाभावेन निर्दोषलोकविलक्षणे हरौ तदनापादिकैवेत्यप्रयोजिकेति । फले तु जन्मादि-सूत्रोक्तसंहर्तृत्वाक्षेपसमाधी ॥ ७ ॥

It is only *Vishnu* who is the universal destroyer. Going by the statement of *Swetashvatara Upanishat* that one gets *moksha* by meditating on *Vishnu*, it is clear that when even the eternally

existing bondage to *samsaara*, the cycle of births and deaths is destroyed by *Vishnu*, no wonder he destroys everything that is under his control. The scripts "He is *Hari* in whom the entire universe dissolves ...", "One who destroys everything is *Hari*", "The creator, mentor and destroyer of this universe is *Hari* alone" assert the fact in no uncertain terms. Since *Rudra* is an intermediary in the actions of destruction of some parts of universe, the usage and scripts that speak of him to be the destructor are valid enough to such an extent.

As regards the logic that father cannot be the killer of his children does not hold good for *Vishnu*, since the father not being the killer is based on the materialistic love towards his children. *Vishnu* is devoid of any defect and hence the simile does not hold good.

॥ ॐ विपर्ययेण तु क्रमोऽत उपपद्यते च ॐ ॥ ८ ॥

viparyayena tu kramo ata upapadyate cha - 8

सर्वस्येशे लयसिद्धौ केन क्रमेणेत्यत्र चिन्तनात्सङ्गतिः । प्रकृताधिभूतानि किं जन्मक्रमानुरोधेन लीयन्ते व्युत्क्रमेण वेति सन्देहः । जन्मक्रमानुसारेणैवेति पूर्वः पक्षः ॥ "क्रमादुत्पद्यते क्रमाद्विलीयते" "क्रमेणोत्पत्तिविलयश्च" "क्रमेणैवास्योत्पत्तिलयौ" इत्यादिक्रमलयश्रुतिबाहुल्यात् । व्युत्क्रमाद्विलयश्चेति श्रुतेस्तु लोके प्रायेणोत्पत्तिक्रमेणैव लयदर्शनयुक्त्यनुगृहीतत्वेन च प्रबलया क्रमलयश्रुत्या बाधितत्वादिति ॥

The discussion here is on the order in which *laya* (dissolution / death) happens for the *tatvas*, the core materials, during the *Pralaya* (deluge). Whether the order of *laya* is the same as that of *utpatti*, creation or in the reverse of it?

It is logical to say that the *laya* happens in the same order of creation – first-in first-out mode. Multiple statements in *vedas* say everything is created in an order and destroyed in an order. Though there is also a vedic statement that the destruction is in the reverse order of creation, it need not be considered since it is opposed by multiple vedic statements backed by the experience that in a majority of the cases aged people die before the younger ones.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ व्युत्क्रमेणैव लीयन्ते "व्युत्क्रमाद्विलयश्च" इत्यादिनिखकाशलय-
श्रुतेः (भाल्लवेय) । क्रमलयश्रुतीनां तु "द्विविधः क्रम उद्दिष्टो व्युत्क्रमोऽनुक्रम-
स्तथा । सृष्टावन्यो लये चान्यः" इत्यादिश्रुत्या व्युत्क्रमस्यापि क्रमत्वेन
सावकाशत्वेन लोके पूर्वोत्पन्नानां पूर्वनाशस्य असामर्थ्यनिमित्तत्वादिह च "पूर्वं
पूर्वं यतो विष्णोः" इत्यादि स्मृत्या पूर्वोत्पन्नानां सामर्थ्याधिक्येन पश्चादपि
लयोपपत्त्या प्रागुक्तयुक्तेरप्रयोजकत्वाच्च व्युत्क्रमश्रुत्यबाधादिति ॥ फले तु
लयश्रुत्या विरोधेनान्यतराप्रामाण्ये अन्यत्राप्यानाश्वासापातेन विष्णोस्संहर्तृत्वा-
द्यसिद्धेः । तदाक्षेपसमाधी ॥ ८ ॥

The order of dissolution is in the reverse to that of creation. The vedic statement “*vyutkramaad vilayashcha*” does not provide room for a different interpretation. Those statements that say that dissolution is also in an order would only mean that even the dissolution follows the pattern and it need not be that of the creation. Hence if it says the dissolution is in an order, that order is in the reverse to that of creation. Hence there is no conflict.

As regards the experience, this is in respect of the tail-end creations that have very minimal capabilities. The *laya* that is discussed is in respect of those created at the beginning of the universal creation. There, the one that is created earlier has far higher strength than those created subsequent to it and so on. Hence, those with lesser strength get dissolved into the stronger

ones and the process continues till everything gets dissolved in God.

॥ ॐ अन्तरा विज्ञानमनसी क्रमेण तल्लिङ्गादिति चेन्नाविशेषात् ॐ ॥९॥

antaraa vijnaana-manasi kramena tallingaaditi-chenna-avisheshaat-9

॥ॐ चराचरव्यपाश्रयस्तु स्यात्तद्व्यपदेशो भाक्तस्तद्भावभावित्वात् ॐ॥

chara-achara-vyapaashrayastu syaat-tadvyapadesho bhaaktas-tadbhaava-bhaavitvaat;

पूर्वोक्तव्युत्क्रमेण लय इत्यस्य क्वचिदपवादशङ्कानिरासात्सङ्गतिः । प्रस्तुत अधिभूतानि सर्वाणि व्युत्क्रमेण लीयन्ते किंवा कानिचित् क्रमेणेति सन्देहः ॥ पूर्वपक्षस्तु ॥ "मनसश्च विज्ञानम्" इति क्रमादुत्पन्नत्वेन श्रुतमनोविज्ञानतत्त्वयोः "यच्छेद्वाङ्मनसी प्राज्ञस्तद्यच्छेत् ज्ञान आत्मनि" इति (का.उ.३-१३) क्रमेणैव लयश्रुतेः मनोविज्ञानतत्त्वे विना, अन्यानि व्युत्क्रमेण लीयन्ते इति । न च मनसश्च विज्ञानमित्यत्र मनोविज्ञानशब्दौ न तत्त्वपरौ किंतु अन्तःकरणवबोध-पराविति युक्तम् । तयोश्शब्दयोर्मनोविज्ञानतत्त्वयोरेव मुख्यत्वेन निर्निमित्तं मुख्यार्थत्यागायोगात् । व्युत्क्रमद्विलयश्चेति सर्वस्य व्युत्क्रमलयश्रुतिस्तु लोके केषांचित्क्रमात् केषाञ्चिद्व्युत्क्रमात् लयदर्शनेन लोकानुसारित्वयुक्त्युपेतया मनोविज्ञानयोः क्रमलयश्रुत्या बाधितेति ॥

The discussion now is on whether the rule that the dissolution is in the reverse order of creation has an exception in *vijnaana* and *manas*. One *Sruti* says "*manasah tu vijnaanam*" - *vijnaana* is created by *manas*. Another one says "*yacched vaank manasi, tadyacchet jnaana aatmani*" - one should meditate that speech dissolves in mind and mind in *jnaana*. Since *veda* specifically tells the order of dissolution in these cases, the generic rule should be treated as with an exception here. It cannot be said that the word *manas* and *vijnaana* are referring to the physical mind and

knowledge but not the core *tatvas*, for there is no reason for discarding the primary sense for the words that mean the respective *tatvas*.

Since we see often younger ones dying before their elders, accepting an exception to the rule should not be a contradiction.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ मनस्तत्त्वान्तरिन्द्रिययोः विज्ञानतत्त्वावबोधयोः क्रमेण मनोविज्ञानशब्दयोः प्रयोगदृष्ट्या तत्त्वमात्रवाचित्वाभावेनेन्द्रियादावपि मुख्यत्वात् । मनसश्च विज्ञानमित्यत्र "विज्ञानतत्त्वं महतः समुत्पन्नं चतुर्मखात्" इति स्मृतिविरोधात् तत्त्वविषयत्वायोगेन अन्तरिन्द्रियतज्ज्यावबोधपरतया, मनोविज्ञानतत्त्वयोः यथोत्पत्तिलय इत्यत्र विशेष प्रमाणाभावात् "सर्वं वैतत्क्रमादुत्पद्यते व्युत्क्रमाद्विलीयत" इत्यादिसर्वव्युत्क्रमलयश्रुतेश्च, सर्वाणि व्युत्क्रमेणैव लीयन्त इति । फले तु श्रुत्योर्विरोधेनाप्रामाण्ये तत्समन्वयेन प्रागुक्तस्रष्टृत्वसंहर्तृत्वाक्षेपसमाधी ॥९॥

The words *manas* and *vijnaana* have their usage in both their core *tatvas* as well as the inner sense of mind and knowledge. Hence respecting their usage, both should be considered as primary meaning of the said words. Since the order of creation "*manas* created *vijnaanam*" contradicts the one said in *vedas* as "*vijnaana tatva* is created by *chaturmukha* from *mahat tatva*", the said order should be taken to refer the internal mind and knowledge and not their *tatvas*. There is nothing to evidence the exceptional order of *laya* for these two *tatvas*. On the contrary, *veda* says "everything is created in an order and they are dissolved in the reverse order". Hence the order of creation and dissolution has no exception to their respective rules.

It is worth noting here that the order of creation and dissolution is not only for the core *tatvas* but also for their respective regulating deities. The deity *uma* regulating speech gets absorbed in *Rudra*,

the regulator of mind and *Rudra* gets absorbed in deity *Vaani*, the one regulating knowledge.

॥ ॐ नात्माऽश्रुतेः नित्यत्वाच्च ताभ्यः ॐ ॥ १० ॥

naatmaa ashruteh nityatvaaccha taabhyah - 10

एवं ब्रह्मान्यस्य सर्वस्य व्युत्क्रमेण लये श्रुत्योक्ते तर्हि ब्रह्मणोऽपि सोऽस्त्विति शङ्कनात्सङ्गतिः । सर्वोत्पत्तिलयकर्तृत्वेन प्रकृतो विष्णुः देहनाशाख्यलयवान्नवेति सन्देहः । "स इदं सर्वं विलाप्यान्तस्तमसिलीयत" इति श्रुतेः सोऽपि लीयत इति प्राप्तम् । नित्यो नित्यानामिति श्रुतिस्तु विष्णुर्लयवान् चेतनत्वात् जीववदिति युक्त्युपेतपूर्वश्रुत्या बाधिता । न च लयश्रुतिः अपिहितत्वपरा, कल्पकाभावात् । "असम्भवस्तु" इत्यत्र (ब्र. सू. २-३-९) ईशस्य स्वातन्त्र्येण हेतुना अनुत्पत्त्युक्तावपि लीलया देहोपादानत्यागोपपत्तेरिति ॥

When everybody is having a *laya*, is it that even *Brahma* also has one, is the subject of discussion here. *Veda* says "He dissolves everything and disappears in *tamas*, the darkness". Hence *Brahma* also has a *laya*. This is supported by the logic "*Brahma* has a *laya*, because he is a *chetana*, like *jeeva*". Hence it is strong and invalidates the other vedic statement that *Brahma* is more eternal than the other eternal beings. It cannot be construed that the statement of *veda* speaking of *laya* for *Brahma* is only in the sense of him getting covered by the darkness. For, there is no evidence to substantiate such a meaning.

If *laya* happens to *Brahma* as well, it would mean that his creation happens from darkness / void. Since it is already proved in the earlier *sootra* (2-3-9) that void cannot be the cause of anything, that does not form a hurdle in accepting *laya* for *Brahma*. Since he is independent and capable, his dissolution and creation can be construed as his voluntary discarding and creation of his body.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ विष्णुः न देहनाशाख्यलयवान् मानाभावात् । तमसि लीयते इति श्रुतेस्तु "तुच्छेनाश्वपिहितं यदासीत्" इति श्रुतौ (ऋ. १०-१२०-३) पूर्वत्र नासदासीदिति सर्वस्य लयमुक्त्वा तम आसीदिति प्रकृतेः स्थितिमुक्त्वा ब्रह्मणस्तदपिहितत्वस्य पुनः प्रादुर्भावस्य चोक्त्या, "तमसि निलीनः प्रकृतिं पुरुषं कालं चानुपश्यति नैनं पश्यति कश्चन" इति पैङ्गिश्रुत्यन्तरेण च अपिहितत्वार्थत्वात्, अन्यथा "नित्यो नित्यानां" "स नित्यो निर्गुणः विभुः" इत्यादिबहुनित्यत्वश्रुतिविरोधात् । युक्तेश्च श्रुतिविरोधेनामानत्वादिति । फले तु ब्रह्मणो लये सृष्ट्याद्ययोगेन तदाक्षेपसमाधी ॥ १० ॥

Vishnu does not have a *laya* in the form of destruction of his body. There is no evidence for such a *laya*. The statement that he disappears would only mean that he gets hidden. *Rig veda*, while narrating the *laya* says that *Brahma* causes *laya* of everything. At that time only *tamas* existed. This *tamas* is nothing but *prakriti*, the subtle matter and its regulating deity goddess *lakshmi*. It then says, *Brahma* hides himself in *tamas*. While being so, he sees *Prakriti*, *kaala* (time) and *purusha* (*jeevas*). However, none of them would see him. This proves that *Brahma* would not experience *laya*. The logic that *Brahma* has *laya* because he is *chetana* is invalid since it contradicts *veda*.

॥ ॐ ज्ञोऽत एव ॐ ॥ ११ ॥

jno ata eva - 11

॥ ॐ युक्तेश्च ॐ ॥

yukteshcha;

एवं सूचीकटाहन्यायेन अल्पमधिभूतादिविचारं कृत्वा इदानीं आपादसमाप्तिं बहुः जीवविचारः क्रियत इति सङ्गतिः । जीवः किमुत्पत्तिमान् उत नेति सन्देहः । नोत्पत्तिमानिति प्राप्तम् । नित्यो नित्यानामिति षष्ठ्यन्तनित्यपदेन जीवानां नित्यत्वोक्तेः "सर्व एते चिदात्मानो व्युच्चरन्ती"ति तदुत्पत्तिश्रुतेस्तु जीवस्वरूपो-

त्पत्तिकारणानुपलब्ध्या कारणशून्यत्वादिति युक्त्युपेतया जीवनित्यत्वश्रुत्या बाधात् । न च स्वरूपोत्पत्तिकारणशून्यानामपि वियदादीनां पराधीनविशेषा-वासिरूपजनितवत् जीवस्यापि सा सिद्धेति वाच्यम् । जन्मश्रुतेः तादृशोत्पत्तिपरत्वे अनुत्पत्तिश्रुतेरपि ब्रह्मणीव जीववियदादावपि तदभावपरत्वोपपत्तेः, अनेकार्थ-त्वस्यान्याय्यत्वात् । एवं च तद्विरोधतादवस्थ्यमिति प्रागुक्तस्यैवात्राक्षेपादिति ॥

The discussions in this chapter and others till the end of this section is on *Jeeva*. Whether or not he has an origin is the subject of discussion in this chapter.

While asserting the super eternity of *Brahma*, *veda* has stated that others are also *nitya* – eternal. The logical deduction that *jeevas* have no origin, for there is no evidence for the existence of their raw materials (*upaadaana kaarana*) supports the vedic statement speaking of eternity and hence another contradicting vedic statement, “*sarve ete chidaatmaano vyuccharanti*” - all these *jeevas* are born, is invalid. Taking a parallel to the concept of origin for the ever existing *aakaasha* etc as *paraadheena-vishesha-avaapti*, if a similar origin is to be construed for *jeevas*, why not take a parallel to *Brahma* and say that *jeeva* has no origin at all? It is injustice to have different meanings for the same word for different objects.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ "ते वा एते चिदात्मानोऽविनष्टाः परंज्योतिर्निविशन्त्यविनष्टा एवोत्पद्यन्ते" (काषायणश्रुतिः) इत्यविनाशैर्नोत्पत्तिश्रुतेः जीवस्य स्वरूपेणानुत्पत्तावपि तदुपाध्युत्पत्त्या पराधीनविशेषावासिरूपोत्पत्तिपरतया तदुत्पत्त्यनुत्पत्तिश्रुत्योः उपाधिस्वरूपपरतया भिन्नविषयत्वेनाविरोधात् । ब्रह्मणि पराधीनविशेषावासिरूपोत्पत्तिश्रुतेरभावेन तत्रानुत्पत्तिश्रुतेस्तदभावपरत्वेऽपि जीवादौ तच्छ्रुतिसत्त्वेन तदनुत्पत्तिश्रुतेस्तदभावपरत्वायोगेन अनेकार्थत्वस्य न्याय्यत्वाच्च देहसम्बन्धाख्यतादृशोत्पत्तिमान् जीव इति । फले तु सर्वस्रष्टृत्वाक्षेपसमाधी ॥ ११ ॥

Kaashaayana sruti clarifies the aspect. It says these *chidaatmaas*, meaning *jeevas* enter *paranjyoti* while remaining undestroyed and while they remain so, they get born. That means they experience births and deaths while they innately remain eternal. Acquiring a body or losing it would mean birth and death for them. Hence those scripts that speak of eternity and of birth refer to different things and hence there exists no contradiction. There is no evidence to say that *Brahma* also has a birth in the form of *paraadheena-vishesha-avaapti* while there are evidences for such a birth to *jeevas*. Hence the argument of taking a parallel to *Brahma* to consider *jeeva* as originless holds no water. Hence it is concluded that *jeeva* has births in the form of acquisition of a bodies.

॥ ॐ उत्क्रान्तिगत्यागतीनाम् ॐ ॥ १२ ॥

Utkraanti-gatyaa-gateenaam – 12

॥ ॐ स्वात्मना चोत्तरयोः ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ नाणुरतच्छ्रुतेरिति चेन्नेतराधिकारात् ॐ
॥ ॥ ॐ स्वशब्दोन्मानाभ्यां च ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ अविरोधश्चन्दनवत् ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ
अवस्थितिवैशेष्यादिति चेन्नाभ्युपगमाद्धृदि हि ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ गुणाद्वा लोकवत् ॐ ॥
svaatmanaa chottarayoh; naanur-atacchruteriti chenna itaraadhikaaraat;
svashabd-onmaanaabhyaam cha; avirodhas-chandanavat; avasthiti-
vaisheshyaaditi chenna abhyugamaad-hridi hi; gunaadvaa lokavat;

जीवे धर्मिणि उत्पत्त्यनुत्पत्ती चिन्तिते । अत्र तद्धर्मे परिमाणेऽणुत्वमहत्वे चिन्त्येते
इति सङ्गतिः । प्रकतो जीवः किं व्याप्नोऽणुर्वेति सन्देहः । व्याप्त इति प्राप्तम् ।
“व्याप्ता ह्यात्मानश्चेतना निर्गुणाश्च” इति (काषायणश्रुतिः) बहुवचनान्तात्म-
व्याप्तत्वश्रुतेः बहुत्वं भिन्नाश्रितमित्युत्सर्गन्यायापवादकस्य “ऋतं पिबन्तौ”
इत्यादाविवेहाभावेन जीवपरत्वात् । “अणुर्ह्येष आत्मा” इति जीवाणुत्वश्रुतेस्तु
अणुत्वे सर्वदेहसम्बन्धस्पर्शादिज्ञानायोगेन तद्देहपरिमाणत्वेन स्पर्शादि-
परिज्ञानमित्यस्य च नेकस्मिनसम्भवात्” इति (ब्र.सू. २-२-३३) नयोक्तदोष-

दुष्टतया अयोगेन सर्वदेहसम्बन्धिस्पर्शादिज्ञानरूपयुक्त्युपेतत्वेन बलवत्या व्याप्तत्वश्रुत्या बाधितत्वात् प्रबलश्रुतिविरुद्धायाः अप्रामाण्योपपत्तेः । न च जीवस्याणुरूपत्वेऽपि अंशैर्व्याप्तत्वेन स्पर्शादिज्ञानं युक्तमिति युक्तिरप्रयोजिकेति वाच्यम् । अंशानां चेतनत्वेन युगपदनेकेषां ऐकमत्यायोगेन विरुद्धक्रियस्य देहस्योन्मथनप्रसङ्गात् । अक्रियत्वस्य वापत्तेः । स्वरूपव्याप्तेरेव वाच्यत्वादिति ।

The size of *jeeva* is discussed in this chapter. Whether he has a macro size or micro size (*aNu*). *Kaashaayana* text of *vedas* says “*vyaaptaa hi aatmaanah..*” *jeevas* are spread everywhere. They are *chetanas* and are devoid of any quality. Since the statement is in plural, the word *aatma* cannot be taken to mean God. He is singular. The rule applied earlier in interpreting “*guhaam pravishtau aatmaanau*” where duality is taken to mean two forms of God is not applicable here, for there is no supporting evidence to that effect. This apart, if *jeeva* were to be *aNu* in size, he would stay in some corner of the physical body. How would then he sense through the entire of his skin? *Jeeva* needs to be in contact with the senses to perceive. Hence the statement that *jeeva* is of *aNu* size is invalid. If it were to be said that *jeevas* have components and that the components are spread over the entire body, even this would not fit in. If *jeeva* has components, the components also need to be *chetanas*. Hence it is possible that they may engage in conflicting actions resulting in either no action or a turbulence in the body. Hence it has to be accepted that *jeevas* have a wide spread shape.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ “सोऽस्माच्छरीरादुत्क्रम्यामुं लोकमधिगच्छत्यमुष्मादिमं लोकमागच्छति” इति श्रुतोत्क्रान्तिगत्यागतिमत्त्वात् पतत्रिवदणुर्जीवः । तासां व्याप्ते गगनादावदृष्ट्या ताभिव्याप्तत्वायोगेन, अनित्यत्वाद्यापत्त्या निरस्त-मध्यमपरिमाणे अणुत्वस्यैव सिद्धेः । “अणुर्ह्येष आत्मा” इति (गौपवन) श्रुतेश्च । “व्याप्ताह्यात्मान” इति (काषायण) श्रुतिस्तु स आत्मेदं सृजतीति विष्णुप्रकरणेन एषो ह्यात्माऽध्युद्गतो मानशक्तेरिति वाक्यशेषे श्रुतात्मश्रुत्युन्मानत्वलिङ्गाभ्यां च गुहानयन्यायेन बहुवचनस्य न्याय्यत्वाद्विष्णुपरा । देहैकदेशस्थचन्दनबिन्दोः

स्वांशैः सर्वदेहव्याप्तिवज्जीवस्यापि हृदि ह्येष आत्मेति श्रुत्या हृद्देशे सम्यक् स्थितस्य स्वरूपांशैः सर्वदेहव्याप्त्या, अंशशून्यानां चान्येषां आलोकवच्चिद्रूपेण सर्वदेहव्याप्त्या स्पर्शादिज्ञानसम्भवेन प्रयोजिकेति । फले तु श्रुतिसमन्वयाक्षेपसमाधी ॥ १२ ॥

Since *jeeva* is described as the one who jumps out of this body and goes to one world and from there to another world etc, he has to necessarily be of small size like a bird. Such a movement cannot be seen in sky etc, that are spread everywhere. A medium size cannot also be accepted as it would mean an imminent destruction. Hence based on the *sruti* “*aNurhyesha aatmaa*” backed by the aforesaid reasoning, the size of *jeeva* should be understood as “*aNu*”. The other *sruti* that says *aatma* as *vyaapta* refers to *Vishnu* since that statement is part of *Vishnu prakarana* – chapter. The very next sentence in that chapter describes *aatma* as the one who is not reachable (fully knowable) through any source. The word *aatma* primarily addresses *Vishnu* only. The plurality is not an issue since a similar case has been discussed in an earlier chapter (1-2-11) where multiplicity is considered as valid by referring to the forms of *Vishnu*.

Though *jeeva* is of atomic size, he is spread across the body like the particles of a perfume that fills the entire room where its drop has fallen. Had it been so, the concentration of *jeeva* must be high at one place similar to that of fragrance where the drop has fallen and lower at far off places. How can this be true? Yes it is true. The concentration of *jeeva* is high in *hridaya* – heart. Thus though *jeeva* has no components, he keeps in contact with the entire body through his *chit guna* like a lamp reaching all corners of the room through its light rays.

॥ ॐ व्यतिरेको गन्धवत्तथा च दर्शयति ॐ ॥ १३ ॥

vyatireko gandhavat tathaa cha darshayati – 13

अत्र यदि जीवोऽणुः तर्हि योगिनो बहुरूपत्वायोग इति पूर्वक्षेपात्सङ्गतिः । जीवः किं एकरूपोऽथवानेकरूप इति सन्देहे एकरूप इति प्राप्तम् । स एकधा न सप्तधा इति श्रुतेः विभावात्मनि योगप्रभावाद्देहबाहुल्येन बाहुरूप्यसम्भवेऽपि अणौ तदयोगादिति युक्तेश्च । अणोरपि अंशैर्बाहुरूप्यमित्यस्यापि "स नित्यो निरवयवः" इति (गौपवन) निरवयवत्वश्रुतिव्याकोपेनायोगात् । योगिनोऽघटितघटकशक्त्या अब्धिपानमिव बाहुरूप्यं स्यादिति त्वीश्वरसाम्यापातेनायुक्तम् । स पञ्चधा स सप्तधेति बाहुरूप्यश्रुतिस्तु सयुक्तिकैकरूप्यश्रुतिबाधितेति ॥

This chapter resolves the conflict that had *jeeva* been of *aNu* size, *yogis* would not have displayed multiple forms (*yogi* is the one who has acquired extraordinary powers through *yoga* because of which he acquires multiple forms and appears at multiple places simultaneously).

Whether or not *jeeva* has multiple forms is the question. *Veda* says *jeeva* has only one form, neither seven, nor ten etc. If he does not have multiple forms but still, as a *yogi* displays them, it is possible only if he is large enough to manifest at multiple places. The other possibility is where *jeeva* has components and that components move away and manifest in other places. This is also not true, for *veda* says he is eternal and a single unit without any components. We cannot even consider that though *jeeva* is of *aNu* size, he acquires impossible powers like drinking the entire ocean and because of such *yogic* powers he presents multiple forms simultaneously. For, if such powers are to be accepted for a *jeeva*, it would mean him to be equal to God, which is not true. Another vedic text that says *jeeva* has five forms, seven forms etc is invalid

since it contradicts the one that says he does not have any and that is supported by the aforesaid reasoning.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ अणोर्भिन्नांशहीनस्यापि जीवस्य योगाराधिताचिन्त्यशक्तिकेश्वर-
प्रसादायत्तसामर्थ्याद्गन्धवदंशविभागेन बहुरुप्यस्योपपत्तेः बहुरूपो जीवः ।
ऐकरूप्यश्रुतिस्तु स्वरूपैक्यपरा । निरवयवत्वश्रुतिरपि भिन्नांशराहित्यपरेति ।
फले तु प्राग्वत् ॥ १३ ॥

It is true that *jeeva* is of *aNu* size and has no components. However, on account of his worshipping God of unimaginable prowess and on account of obtaining his grace, a *yogi* exhibits components like a drop of perfume spreading the entire area. With such components, he manifests in multiple forms. The texts that say *jeeva* has only one form is with reference to his *swaroopa*, the core. Even the texts that say he does not have components also speak of non-existence of components that are different from him.

॥ ॐ पृथगुपदेशात् ॐ ॥ १४ ॥

prithag-upadeshaat – 14

॥ ॐ तद्गुणसारत्वात्तु तद्वयपदेशः प्राज्ञवत् ॐ ॥

tadguna-saaratvaat-tu tadvapadeshah prajnavat;

जीवेशयोरेक्यान्नजीवशक्तेरीशायत्तत्वमिति शङ्कनात्सङ्गतिः । जीवः किं ईशेन
भिन्नोऽभिन्नो वेति सन्देहः । अभिन्न इति प्राप्तं, तत्त्वमसीत्यादौ पदद्वयलक्षणया
जीवपरैक्यश्रुतेः । अस्याश्च एकमेवाद्वितीयमित्युपक्रमात्, तत्त्वमसीत्युपसंहारात्,
तत्त्वमसि तत्त्वमसीति नवकृत्वोऽभ्यासात्, ऐक्यस्य मानान्तराप्राप्त्या
अपूर्वत्वात्, तस्य तावदेव चिरमिति फलवत्त्वात्, येनाश्रुतं श्रुतं भवतीत्य-
र्थवादात् मृण्मयादिदृष्टान्तेनोपपादनाच्च षड्विधतात्पर्यलिङ्गोपेतत्वेन प्रावल्यात् ।
द्वासुपर्णेत्यादिभेदश्रुतिरप्रमाणम् । अन्यथैक्यश्रुतेर्निर्विषयत्वापात इति ॥

In the previous chapter it is said that though *jeeva* is of *anu* size, he takes up multiple forms due to the grace of God who has extraordinary qualities. Why should it be so? Since *Jeeva* is no different from God, the referred extraordinary qualities are of *jeeva* alone. No question of somebody's grace in acquiring special powers. This argument is examined in this chapter by validating the concept of *jeeva* and God being one and the same.

Veda says “*tat tvam asi*”. The word *tat* which literally means “that”, *tvam* means “you” and *asi* means “are” - you are him.

The rules of interpretation of vedic texts lay emphasis on the following – *upakrama* (beginning), *upasamhaara* (conclusion), *abhyaasa* (repetitive expression), *apoorvata* (something new or unknown), *phalam* (benefits), *arthavaada* (glorification), *upapatti* (logical propriety).

Let us now examine whether the above interpretation of “you are him” fits into the above rules.

The portion of *upanishat* that has spoken so

- has a beginning containing words “*ekam eva adviteeyam*” (There is only one and no second) - *upakrama*.

The words “*tat tvam asi*” are in conclusion - *upasamhaara*
the same words “*tat tvam asi*” have been repeated multiple (nine) times - *abhyaasa*.

The oneness of *jeeva* and God cannot be known through other means, hence *apoorvata*.

This knowledge leads to *moksha* – hence *phalam*.

Upanishat further says that once this union is understood, everything unheard / unknown by him is as good as heard / known etc – *arthavaada*.

Upanishat says when a person knows clay, he has known all earthen articles of pot, stove etc – *upapatti*.

Hence this statement of *jeeva* and God being one is strong enough and other texts opposing this by telling *jeeva* and God are like two birds on a branch of a tree etc are weak and invalid.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ "भिन्नोऽचिन्त्यः परमो जीवसङ्गात्पूर्णः परो जीवसङ्गोऽह्यपूर्णः" इत्यादि (कौशिक) भेदश्रुतेः कदाप्यैकाधिकरणयायोग्यधर्मकत्वरूपविरुद्ध-धर्माधिकरणत्वादियुक्त्युपेतत्वेन "शास्त्रगम्यपरेशानाद्भेदः स्वात्मन ईयते । अनुभूतिविरोधेन कथमेकत्वमुच्यते" इत्यनुव्याख्यानोक्तदिशा उपजीव्यत्वेन प्राबल्यात् । तद्विरोधेनानुभवविरोधेन च पदद्वयलक्षणातः तत्पदमात्रगौणार्थत्वस्य ज्यायस्त्वेन च तत्त्वमसीत्यादेः तदीयज्ञानानन्दादिगुणसदृशगुणतया तत्सदृश-स्त्वमसीत्यर्थकत्वोपपत्तेः ऐक्यपरत्वायोगात् । उपक्रमादेः मानान्तराविरुद्ध एव तात्पर्यगमकत्वात् । अन्यत्र ग्रन्थकारैरन्यथा व्याख्यातत्वाच्च भिन्न एव ईशाजीव इति ॥ १४ ॥

Koushika sruti says "God is different from and superior to the entire lot of *jeevas*. His capabilities are unimaginable. He is supreme and complete in every aspect. *Jeevas* on the contrary are incomplete". In view of the contradicting attributes, it can never be considered that God and *jeevas* are one and the same. Sri Acharya has told in *Anuvyaakhyana* "God is known only through *vedas* and they tell him to be different from *jeevas*. Our experience also speaks of we being different from God. How then can *jeevas* be considered as one with God"? Any logic that speaks of union between God and *jeevas* has to necessarily depend on *Vedas* that introduces God to us and *anubhava* (experience) that tells us about *jeeva*. This being so, such logic cannot contradict its very base to derive unity between God and *jeevas*. The statement "*tat tvam asi*" is interpreted to mean unity between God and *Jeevas* by ignoring the attributes of both of them and relying only on the basic

meaning of *tat* and *tvam*. Since it contradicts *veda* and the experience, such a meaning is incorrect. Instead, an interpretation where only the word “*asi*” is assigned a secondary meaning would be more appropriate. It would thus mean that “you are similar to God in his qualities of *jnaana*, *aananda* etc”. Here only the word “*sadrisho* – similar to” is added in the statement “you are him”. As far as the applicability of other rules like *upakrama* etc in interpretation, they are valid only when they lead to a meaning that does not contradict other evidences.

This aspect has been dealt in a different way by Sri Acharya in *Vishnutatva vinirnaya* book.

॥ ॐ यावदात्मभावित्वाच्च न दोषस्तद्दर्शनात् ॐ ॥ १५ ॥

yaavadaatma-bhaavitvaaccha na doshah taddarshanaat - 15

“बन्धान्मोक्षं तत एवाभिवाञ्छेत्” इति पूर्वोक्तानादिबन्धानन्तमोक्षाक्षेपेण-
शङ्कनात् सङ्गतिः । जीवः किं नित्योऽनित्यो वेति सन्देहः । अनित्य इति प्राप्तम्
। ब्रह्मन् लयमभ्युपैतीति श्रुतेः । ज्ञोऽतएवेत्यत्रोपाधेर्जन्मोक्त्या प्रतिबिम्बस्य
जन्मावश्यंभावात् । जनिमतश्च विनाशित्वनियमादिति युक्तेश्च । न च
देहाख्योपाधेर्जनिमत्त्वेऽपि अन्य एव जीवोपाधिरनादिनित्य इत्यत्र कल्पक-
मस्तीति । जीवस्यानादिकर्मसम्बन्धानन्त्यप्राप्त्युक्त्या जीवानादित्वपरा
“सोऽनादिना पुण्येने” त्यादिश्रुतिः सयुक्तिकाऽनित्यत्वश्रुतिविरोधादमानमिति ॥

The bondage to the cycle of births and deaths has been with *jeevas* at all times and *moksha* is said to be eternal. It is said “liberation from this bondage shall be got only from God”. This chapter discusses the propriety of the above facts.

Whether *jeeva* is eternal in existence or not is the doubt. He cannot be eternal, for *veda* says “he disintegrates in *Brahma*”. In the earlier *sootra*, “*jno ata eva*” (2-2-11) it has been said that the

upaadhi (reflector), because of which *jeeva* stays as an image of God, gets created. It then necessarily means that image is also born after that. It is a rule that whatever is born will have an end. It cannot be said that there are different *upaadhis* and that the one referred to as born (physical body) is different from the one that is causing the image. There is no evidence to that effect. The vedic text “*so anaadina punyena ...*” that speaks of an eternity of *karma* thus implying eternity to *jeeva* is invalidated by the vedic text that speaks of a *laya* (disintegration) of *jeeva* in *Brahma*, which is strengthened by the aforesaid logic.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ "नित्यः परो नित्यो जीवः, सुखदुःखे त्वनित्ये इत्यादिश्रुति-
स्मृत्यन्यथानुपपत्त्याऽनादिनित्योपाधेरवश्यकल्प्यत्वाज्जीवोपाधिर्द्विधा प्रोक्त
इत्यादिवचनाच्च स्वरूपोपाधेरनादिनित्यतया सर्वगतविम्बेशोपाधिसन्निधेरपि
तथात्वेनानादिनित्यो जीवः । लयश्रुतिस्तु बाह्योपाधिपरेति ॥ १५ ॥

If the statements in *veda* and *smriti*, that say God is eternal, *Jeeva* is eternal and the pleasures and pains are transient, are to be valid, it is essential that the *upaadhi* causing *jeeva* as a reflection of God, should also be eternal in existence. This would in turn mean that there are two *upaadhis* – one being eternal and the other that is transient. This fact is also supported by the scripts that say “*jeevopaadhir dvidhaa proktah svaroopam baahya eva cha. Baahyopaadhir layam yaati muktaavanyasya tu stithih* - The *upaadhi* of *jeeva* is of two types – the innate and external. While the external perishes, the other (that is responsible for *jeeva* to be an image of God) stays even in *moksha*”. Now for an image to exist, there should be an object, a reflector and their proximity. In the case of *jeeva*, God is eternal and hence he exists at all times. The reflector, *upaadhi* is eternal and since God is omnipresent, the proximity is ensured at all times. Hence it stands proved that *jeeva* is eternal and whatever disintegration that the vedic text speaks of is in respect of the external *upaadhi*.

॥ ॐ पुंस्त्वादिवत्त्वस्य सतोऽभिव्यक्तियोगात् ॐ ॥ १६ ॥

pumstvaadi-vatvasya sato abhivyakti-yogaat - 16

॥ ॐ नित्योपलब्ध्यनुपलब्धिप्रसङ्गोऽन्यतरनियमो वान्यथा ॐ ॥

nityopalabdh-yanupalabdh-prasango anyatara-niyamo vaanyatha;

पूर्वत्र पृथगधिकरणाद्यसूत्रे बन्धान्मोक्षं तत एवाभिवाञ्छेदिति उपदेश उपपादितः । अत्र तु तदीयद्वितीयसूत्रोक्तं तद्गुणसारत्वमुपपाद्यत इति सङ्गतिः । जीवो ज्ञानानन्दादिरूपो न वेति सन्देहः । न ज्ञानानन्दादिरूप इति प्राप्तम् । “स दःखाद्विमुक्त आनन्दीभवति” इत्यादिश्रुतेः । इदानीं ज्ञानानन्दादिरूपतानुपलब्धेश्च अहमिति जीवे भासमानेऽपि तत्स्वरूपस्यानन्दादेः प्रतिबन्धादनुपलब्धिरित्यस्य अयोगेन ज्ञानाभावादन्यस्य भावरूपाज्ञानस्य प्रतिबन्धकस्याभावाच्च । देहादेस्तु सुखाद्यनुभवरूपभोगायतनत्वेन तत्प्रतिबन्धकत्वायोगाच्च । आनन्दादिरूपत्वे मोक्षाय प्रयत्नवैयर्थ्याच्च । “विज्ञानात्मा” (ष.उ.४-११) “स आनन्दः” इत्यादिश्रुतिस्त्वनुपलब्धियुक्त्युपेतानानन्दादिश्रुत्या बाधिता न मानमिति ॥

The later part of *Koushika sruti* quoted in the earlier chapter “*prithagupadeshat*” (2-3-14) says “one has to seek a release from the bondage of births and deaths only from Him”. This chapter discusses the subject matter of its supplementary *sootra* “*tadgunasaaratvaat ...*”. Whether or not *jeeva* is an embodiment of *jnaana* (knowledge) and *aananda* (pleasure) is the doubt. Since veda says “*sa dukhaad vimuktah aanandee bhavati* – he gets freed from all pains and becomes full of *aananda*”, it clearly means that *jeeva* was not an embodiment of pleasure but becomes full of it on achieving *moksha*. It is also the experience of everyone that he is not full of pleasure. Had pleasure been his own *swaroopa* (inherent attribute), the same would have been experienced at all times. It is not that there is some obstacle in its experience. The sense of *aham* (me) which is also in *swaroopa* is being experienced at all times. Hence there is no obstacle / veil preventing what is naturally

available with *jeeva*. It cannot again be said that *ajnaana* (ignorance) is preventing the experience of knowable and pleasure. For, an absence of knowledge cannot be an obstacle to experience knowledge. There is no evidence to say that there is some *ajnaana* in material form (*bhaava roopa*) causing the obstruction. The physical body cannot be the obstacle since it is a tool to experience pleasure etc. Had *jeeva* been naturally full of pleasure etc, there is no purpose for exerting to achieve *moksha*. Hence the vedic texts that say “*vijnaanaatma*”, “*sa anaandah*” describing *jeeva* as an embodiment of knowledge and pleasure stand invalidated by the one that speaks of him “becoming” full of pleasure, which in turn is backed by the aforesaid reasoning.

सिद्धान्तस्तु॥ "नित्यानन्दो नित्यज्ञानो नित्यबलः परमात्मा"
 "नित्यानन्दज्ञानबला देवा" इत्यादिश्रुतिस्मृतिभिः जीवस्य ज्ञानादिरूपतोक्तेः।
 बाल्येऽनभिव्यक्तपुंस्त्वादेः पश्चाद्व्यक्त्या पुमानित्युक्तिवत्प्राक् सतामेव
 ज्ञानानन्दादीनां पश्चादभिव्यक्त्या आनन्दीभवतीत्यादिभेदव्यपदेशस्य श्रुत्यादिषु
 सिद्धत्वात् सुखाद्यात्मकस्य आवरणानङ्गीकारे नित्यं तदुपलम्भापातेन
 अवश्याभ्युपेयावरणविशेषशक्त्या अनुपलब्धेश्चोपपत्तेः सम्यग्व्यक्त्यर्थ
 प्रयत्नसम्भवाच्च ज्ञानादिरूपोऽयं जीवः इति । श्रुतौ "एवं सुराः"
 इत्यध्याहारादिष्टसिद्धिः ॥ १६ ॥

Various vedic and other texts state that God is eternally an embodiment of pleasure, knowledge and strength and that the deities are also so albeit in limited scope. Since deities are also *jeevas*, it becomes evident that *jeevas* are embodiments of knowledge and pleasure. This being so, they do not experience the same till the time they achieve *moksha*. Just like a child that does not exhibit the masculinity or femininity till the time it matures though it had the said quality from the inception, *jeevas* exhibit their eternally available pleasure and knowledge on achieving *moksha*. The words “*evam suraah*” need to be appended to the

quoted vedic text “nityaanando nityajnaano nityabalah paramaatmaa naivam asuraah, evam anevam cha manushyaah”, that speaks of God being an embodiment of knowledge and pleasure eternally.

॥ ॐ कर्ता शास्त्रार्थवत्त्वात् ॐ ॥ १७ ॥

kartaa shaastra-arthavatvaat – 17

॥ ॐ विहारोपदेशात् ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ उपादानात् ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ व्यपदेशाच्च क्रियायं न चेन्निर्देशविपर्ययः ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ उपलब्धिवदनियमः ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ शक्तिविपर्ययात् ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ समाध्यभावाच्च ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ यथा च तक्षोभयथा ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ परात्तु तच्छ्रुतेः ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ कृतप्रयत्नापेक्षस्तु विहितप्रतिषेधावैयर्थ्यादिभ्यः ॐ ॥

vihaar-opadeshaat; upaadaanaat; vyapadeshaaccha kriyaayaam na chennirdesha-viparyayah; upalabdhivad-anityamah; shakti-viparyayaat; samaadhy-abhaavaaccha; yathaa cha taksho-bhayathaa; paraattu tacchruteh; krita-prayatna-apekshastu vihita-pratishedhaa-vairthyaadibhyah;

अस्त्वानन्दादीनां सतामभिव्यक्तिः न तु कर्तृत्वस्य तस्य कदाप्यभावादिति शङ्कनात्सङ्गतिः । जीवः किं कर्ता न वेति सन्देहः । न कर्तेति प्राप्तम् । नान्यः कर्तेति श्रुतेः । सर्वत्रेशस्यैव कर्तृवाङ्गीकारे लाघवाच्च । इतरव्यपदेशादित्यादौ (ब्र. सू. २-१-२२) हिताकरणादियुक्त्या जीवकर्तृत्वस्य निषेधाच्च । न च श्रुतिसूत्रयोः स्वतन्त्रकर्तृत्वनिषेधेऽपि परतन्त्रं तदस्त्विति वाच्यम् । पारतन्त्र्या-ख्यकर्तृत्वशक्तेः स्वाधीनत्वेऽपि तक्षणः प्रासादकारयितृपुमधीनत्ववत् वेतनदानादिना ईशाधीनत्वरूपत्वे आत्मानमन्तरो यमयतीति श्रुतिविरोधात् दारुयोषावदीशाधीनचेष्टकत्वे कर्तृत्वस्याकर्तृत्व एव पर्यवसानात् तद्वदेव विधिनिषेधायोग्यः स्यात् । अत एव सयुक्तिकाकर्तृत्वश्रुतिविरोधात् “यत्कर्म कुरुते तदभिसम्पद्यते” इति जीवकर्तृत्वश्रुतिरमानमिति ॥

This chapter deals with the objection that though the qualities of knowledge and pleasure are innately available with *jeevas*, this is not so with respect to independence of actions (*kartritva*). Whether

or not *jeeva* is a *karta* (doer) is the question. He is not so is the proposition. For, veda itself says that none other than God is *karta*. It is simpler to accept him as the creator etc of everything instead of considering him to be so for larger aspects and considering *jeeva* as *karta* in smaller things etc. In the earlier chapter (2-1-7) it is already decided that *jeeva* cannot be *karta* based on the reasoning that he is neither able to do what he desires nor is he able to avoid the undesirables. It is not even that only the independence of *jeeva* in the performance of tasks is negated in the referred *sootra* and vedic texts and not the performance itself, for that would mean *jeeva* being a subordinated worker like the carpenter who works for his master for wages. Such a thing is not true in the case of *jeevas*. *Veda* says God energizes and enables performance of every task by staying within the person performing the tasks and with absolute control. When a person does some task with such extreme dependence on God, it certainly means him to be an instrument like a (stringed) wooden doll that dances to the moves made by its master and not a *karta*. This transpires that the dos and donts prescribed by *vedas* have no relevance to *jeeva* who has no freedom to choose and act. Thus the vedic text “*yatkarma kurute tadabhisampadyate* – one reaps the fruits of whatever he does” is not valid since it contradicts another text that says none other than God is *karta*, which in turn is backed by the aforesaid reasoning and hence stronger.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ जडेशमुक्तान् प्रत्यप्रवृत्तस्य विधिनिषेधाख्यशास्त्रस्य अर्थवत्त्वा-
न्यथानुपपत्तिरूपयुक्त्या मोक्षाद्यर्थसाधनाद्यनुष्ठानदर्शनात् प्रत्यक्षेण "आत्मानमेव
लोकमुपासीत" इत्यादावुपासनादिक्रियायां जीवस्य कर्तृत्वश्रवणेन च कर्तृत्व-
सिद्धेः । अपूर्णशक्तित्वापूर्णकामत्वहेतुभ्यां "कर्तृत्वं करणत्वं च" इति श्रुत्या च
तस्य पारतन्त्र्यसिद्ध्या दारुयोषावदीशाधीनचेष्टकत्वरूपपरतंत्रकर्तृत्वाङ्गीकारेण
प्रागुक्तश्रुतिसूत्रस्मृतिविरोधाभावात् अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां पराधीनकर्तृत्वशक्ति-

कत्वस्यैव विधिनिषेधयोग्यत्वे तंत्रत्वकल्पनेन विधिनिषेधशास्त्राद्वैयर्थ्यात् कर्ता जीव इति ॥ १७ ॥

The mandates for performance and abstinence (dos and donts) prescribed in *vedas* should have an audience. It cannot be the lifeless *jada* objects, it cannot be God, for he is not bound by anything. It cannot even be those who have attained *moksha*. They are also free from any kind of bondages and stipulations. Thus, it precipitates to those *jeevas* who are in this world. It is also seen that those seeking *moksha* are engaged in such prescribed tasks. The vedic prescription that a seeker should do *upaasana* of God implies *kartritva* in *jeeva*. The referred incapacity to achieve the desired results and possessing unfulfilled desires is due to inadequacy of capabilities and due to dependence on God. Since the *kartritva* in *jeeva* is dependent on God, he remains a *karta* though under the control of God, like the wooden doll. Thus, there is no conflict in the vedic scripts that say only God as *karta*, for he alone is the independent performer and those scripts that prescribe tasks to *jeeva* implying him to be *karta*, do so considering him as a dependent one. Since the vedic prescriptions of performance and abstinence can only be for those who have a capacity to do so, it is essential to consider *Jeevas* as *kartas* and that the vedic prescriptions are not a waste.

॥ ॐ अंशो नानाव्यपदेशादन्यथाचापि दाशकितवादित्वमधीयत एके ॐ ॥ १८ ॥

*amsho naanaa-vyapadeshaad-anyathaa-chaapi daasha-
kitavaaditvam adheeyate eke - 18*

॥ ॐ मंत्रवर्णात् ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ अपि स्मर्यते ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ प्रकाशादिवन्नैवं परः ॐ
॥ ॥ ॐ स्मरन्ति च ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ अनुज्ञापरिहारौ देहसंबंधाज्ज्योतिरादिवत् ॐ ॥
॥ ॐ असन्ततेश्चाव्यतिकरः ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ आभास एव च ॐ ॥

mantravarnaat; api smaryate; prakaasha-ativannaivam parah; smaranti cha; anujnaa-pariharou deha-sambandhaaj-jyotiraadivat; asantateshcha-avyatikarah; aabhaasa eva cha;

परान्तु तच्छ्रुतेरिति पूर्वोक्तयोर्जीवेशयोः उपजीव्योपजीवकत्वरूपः संबंधः अत्र प्रसाध्यत इति संगतिः । जीवः किं ईशस्यांशत्वेनानंशत्वेन वा निर्णेतुं शक्यो न वेति संदेहः । न शक्य इति प्राप्तम् । तथाहि । न तावदंशत्वनिर्णयः शक्यः । "अंशा एव हीमे जीवा" इति (गौपवन) अंशत्वश्रुतेः । नैवांशो न सम्बन्धः परस्य इत्यनंशत्वश्रुतेः । जीवस्यापि ईशांशत्वे मत्स्यादिसाम्यापाताच्च । नाप्यनंश इति निर्णयः शक्यः अंशा एव हीत्युक्तेः । न व्रीहियववद्विकल्पोऽपि । विशेषप्रमाणाभावात् । न षोडशिग्रहणाग्रहणवत् देशकालादिभेदेन वा व्यवस्थितविकल्पोऽपि । अतो न मानं श्रुतिद्वयमिति ॥

One of the supplementary *sootras* in the previous chapter viz., *paraat tu tacchruteh* said that the capabilities of *jeeva* are provided by God. This chapter speaks of a guardian-ward relationship between God and *jeevas*. The question here is whether it can be decided that *jeeva* is an *amsha* (part) of God or that he is not so.

There can be no such conclusion. For, *Goupavana* text of vedas says "*amshaa eva hi ime jeevaah* – all these *jeevas* are parts of God" *Bhaallaveya* text of vedas says "*naivaamsho na sambandhah parasya* – There are no parts in God, nor are there any relationships in him". If *jeevas* are to be considered as *amsha* of God, they would then be on par with the incarnations of God like *matsya* and *kurma*, that are known to be his *amshas*. We cannot even decide that *jeevas* are not *amshas* of God. For, the quoted text says "*amsha hi* – they certainly are *amshas*". In the performance of *yaaga*, there is a provision to use rice as offering and in some cases to use a specific kind of wheat in its place. There is no such scope for considering *jeevas* as *amshas* in some circumstances and not so in others. There is no evidence providing for such variance. We cannot even consider *jeevas* as *amsha* and not so based on

predefined set of circumstances like place and time, the way such alternates are available in *yaaga* for performing and non-performing *shodashi* procedures depending on time and place. For, there is no evidence in support of such definition.

Since the conflict in the vedic statements cannot be resolved, they both should be treated as invalid.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ जीवः पुत्रादिः पित्रादेरिवेशपोष्यत्वादिना तद्वर्धवासित्वेन तदन्तर्भूतत्वात्, तदुपजीवकत्वेन तत्सम्बन्धिरूपतया वा ततो न्यूनत्वे सति किञ्चित्तत्सदृशरूपतया वा तदंश एव "अंशो ह्येष परस्य" इति प्रकृत्य "नानाह्येन व्यपदिशन्ति पितेति पुत्रेति भ्रातेति" इतिनानाप्रकारेण ईशसम्बन्धोक्त्या तथा "अन्यः परोऽन्यो जीव" इति "ब्रह्मदाशा ब्रह्मकितवा" इति च श्रुतिद्वये भेदाभेदोक्त्यन्यथानुपपत्त्या, यथाक्रममुक्तद्विरूपांशत्वसिद्धेः । "पादोऽस्य विश्वाभूतानि" इति मन्त्रवर्णात् "ममैवांशो जीवलोके" इति स्मरणाद्यानंशश्रुतेः स्वरूपांशत्वनिषेधपरत्वोपपत्तेः । तेजोऽभिमान्यंशयोः कालाग्रिखद्योताभिमानिनोरिव "एते स्वांशकलाः पुंसः" इत्यादिभाष्योक्तस्मृतिसिद्धायथाक्रममुक्तस्वरूपास्वरूपांशत्वाभ्यां यथा सूर्यांशयोः प्रभाभिमान्यपभ्रष्टाभिमानिनोरिव स्वांश्यायत्तप्रवृत्तिराहित्यतद्वत्ताभ्यां संपूर्णशक्तिकत्वतदभावाभ्यां ईशाप्रतिबिम्बत्वतत्प्रतिबिम्बत्वाभ्यां च मत्स्यादीशावतारजीवयोः ईशांशत्वाविशेषेऽपि साम्यानापत्तेः श्रुतिद्वयाविरोधान्मानमेवेति ॥ १८ ॥

Amshas can be of different types – *swaroopa amsha* and *bhinna amsha*. A son is called as an *amsha* of his father. In such a sense *jeeva* is considered as *amsha* of God. He is also considered as such for the reason that he is fed and protected by God. It is also so because *jeeva* stays in the womb of God, because God stays inside *jeeva*, because *jeeva* is dependent on God, because he is related to God etc. He is also considered as *amsha* of God for the reason that he is similar to God but far inferior to him. *Veda* says "*jeeva* is an *amsha* of God" and proceeds to say "God is considered as having many a relationship with *jeeva*, as father, son, brother", thus

indicating the existence of a relationship. It also says “The supreme is different and *jeeva* is different” rejecting the oneness (*swaroompa amsha*) of *jeeva* and God. It also says “*brahmadaashaa brahmakitavaah* – The fishermen are God, the tribal are God” indicating that all *jeevas* are *amshas* – *bhinna amsha*”. *Purusha sookta* says “*paado asya vishwaa bhootaani* – all *jeevas* put together form a quarter of Him”. *Bhagavat Geeta* says “*mamaivaamsho jeevaloke* – These *jeevas* are my own *amsha*”. In view of these evidences, the fact of *jeevas* being *amsha* of God cannot be negated. Hence the statement “*naivaamsho*” etc should be meant to negate *jeevas* being God’s *swaroompa amsha*.

We can see such distinctions between *swaroompa* and *bhinna amshas* in others as well. While *kaala agni* that burns the universe is *swaroompa amsha* of *agni* deity, fireflies are his *bhinna amsha*. The quotations provided by Sri Achaarya in his *Bhaashya* from *Bhaagavata* and *Varaha puraana* provide ample description of these *swaroompa* and *bhinna amshas*. The difference between *swaroompa* and *bhinna amshas* is that *bhinna amshas* depend on their principal source for their activities while *swaroompas* being principals themselves, have no such dependence. Eg., Sunlight is *swaroompa amsha* of Sun, whereas other lights like that of moon, stars etc are dependent on Sun. Similarly, the *swaroompa amshas* of God like *matsya*, *koorma*, *vaamana* are complete in all respects like the original form *Naarayana* while *jeevas* being reflections of God are *bhinna amshas*. They have limited capabilities and are dependent on God for their existence and activities.

In view of the existence of two types of *amshas* as detailed above, the vedic texts that deny existence of *amshas* in God and those that assert their existence have different aspects in reference and hence there is no conflict between them.

॥ ॐ अदृष्टानियमात् ॐ ॥ १९ ॥

adrishta-aniyamaat;

॥ ॐ अभिसन्ध्यादिष्वपि चैवम् ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ प्रदेशादिति चेन्नान्तर्भावात् ॐ ॥
abhi-sandhyaadishvapi chaivam; pradeshaaditi chenna antarbhaavaat;

अवतारेण जीवस्यासाम्ये पूर्वहेतुकृतप्रतिबिम्बत्वाक्षेपेण शङ्कनात्सङ्गतिः । जीवः किं ईशप्रतिबिम्बो न वेति सन्देहे नेति प्राप्तम् । “न सम्बन्धो नापेक्ष्यः जीवः परस्य” इति बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बभावरूपसम्बन्धनिषेधश्रुतेः सुरासुरनरतिर्यगरूप-वैचित्र्यो पेतत्वात् घटादिवत् जीवा नैकप्रतिबिम्बा इति युक्तेश्च । “रूपं रूपं प्रतिरूपो बभूव” इति श्रुतिस्तु सयुक्तिकपूर्वश्रुतिविरोधादमानमिति ॥

Though *jeevas* are not similar to the incarnations of God, they are considered as *amshas* of God for the reason that they are reflections of God. This aspect of them being reflections is examined in this chapter. Whether or not *jeeva* is a *pratibimba* (reflection) of God is the question. The objection says he is not, for *veda* says “*na sambandho naapekshyah jeevah parasya* – There is neither a relationship for God with *jeeva* nor does he need *jeeva*”. This statement clearly denies the object-image relationship between God and *jeeva*. There is also a logic in considering so - *Jeevas* are not reflections of one object, for they have the variety in the form of deities, demons, humans, animals etc. There would be no variety in images of one object. The vedic text “*roopam roopam prati roopam babhoova* – *jeevas* became the reflections of God” is invalid for contradicting the earlier text that has the support of reasoning.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ बिम्बस्यैकरूपत्वेऽपि जीवस्यानादिस्वरूपोपाध्यविद्याकर्मादि-वैचित्र्येण प्रतिबिम्बवैचित्र्योपपत्तेः रूपं रूपमिति श्रुतेः प्रतिबिम्बो जीवः। न

सम्बन्ध इति श्रुतिः भिन्नोपाध्यायत्तत्वरूपप्रतिबिम्बत्वनिषेधपरेति । अत्र प्रतिनयं समन्वयाक्षेपसमाधी फले वक्तव्ये ॥

One object causing a variety in the images is possible on account of the 'reflecting surfaces being varied. In this case, the innate natural body of *jeevas* is the reflector (*upaadhi*) and the said *upaadhis* are highly varied. Hence a variety in the reflections of a single object of God is perfectly in order and so is the vedic text *roopam roopam* depicting the fact of *jeevas* being reflections of God. The text denying the relationship speaks of the absence of any relationship through any external *upaadhi*.

॥ इति श्रीराघवेन्द्रयतिकृतायां न्यायमुक्तावल्यां द्वितीयाध्यायस्य तृतीयः पादः ॥

द्वितीयाध्यायस्य चतुर्थः पादः

अत्र पूर्वेण सङ्गतिः प्रागेवोक्ता ॥

The link for this section with that of the earlier one is as told for the earlier one – handling the simpler aspects in the beginning and tougher later.

॥ ॐ तथा प्राणाः ॐ ॥ १ ॥

tathaa praanah - 1

॥

ॐ गौण्यसम्भवात् ॐ॥ ॥ॐ प्रतिज्ञानुपरोधाच्च ॐ॥

gouny-asambhavaat; pratijna-anuparodhaaccha;

अत्र प्राणाः किमुत्पत्तिमन्तो न वेति सन्देहे नेति प्राप्तम् । "प्राणा एवेदमग्र आसुः" इत्यनादित्वश्रुतेः । न च "स इदं सर्वमसृजते"ति (तै. २-६) श्रुतिविरोधः । सामान्यव्यवधानाभावरूपस्पष्टार्थयाऽनवकाशया प्राचीनविशेषश्रुत्या सामान्य-श्रुतेर्बाधात् । न च "एतस्माज्जायते प्राणो मनस्सर्वेन्द्रियाणि च" इति (मुं. २-१-३) विशेषश्रुतिविरोधः ॥ "नोपादानं हीन्द्रियाणाम्" इति स्मृत्युक्तनिरुपादानत्व-युक्त्या श्रुतेर्बाधादमानमिति ॥

The word "*Praana*" here means "*indriya*" - the senses. Whether or not they are born is the subject of discussion in this chapter. It should be remembered that *indriya* here does not refer to the physical ones that are available in all the bodies but of the original *tatva* and their regulating deities.

Veda says "*praanaa eva idam agra aasuh*" - *praanas* only existed in the beginning. The statement of *taittiriya upanishat* that God created everything does not pose any contradiction. For, this sentence that speaks of eternity is crystal clear without itself being

a generic one or the one spoken with some gap in-between to allow a different interpretation. Hence this itself would pose an opposition to the generic statement that everything has been created by God and not the other way. Another vedic statement says that there is no raw material for *indriyas*. If something exists but did not have a source material, it is certain that it is not created but eternal in existence.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ "स प्राणमसृजत" "स प्राणान्" "एतस्माज्जायते प्राण" इत्यादि-विशेषश्रुत्या "स इदं सर्वम्" इति सामान्यश्रुतिसध्रीचीनया तथाल्पशक्तित्वादि-वियन्नयोक्तयुक्त्या च प्राणानां जन्मसिद्धेः। "नित्यान्येतानि सौक्ष्म्येण" इति (भविष्यत्पर्व) स्मृत्या सूक्ष्मरूपेणानादित्वनिरुपादानत्ववत्त्वेऽपि सृष्टिकाले भूताद्यवयवैरुपचयसत्त्वेन जन्मोपपत्त्या सावकाशानादित्वश्रुतियुक्तिबाधाभावात् प्राणा उत्पत्तिमन्त इति । अत्रापि प्रतिनयं प्राग्वदेव पूर्वोत्तरपक्षफले ॥१॥

The *vedic* statements "he created *praana*", "he created *indriyas*", "*praana* takes birth from him" are very specific and are backed by the generic statement "*sa idam sarvam*" - he created everything of this. Hence are powerful. They are supported by the logic of something must be a created one if it has limited power / strength as described in chapter "*na viyad ashroteh*"(2-3-1). Hence it stands proved that *indriyas* were born. *Bhavishyat parva* of *Mahabharata* clarifies the point that these *indriyas* are eternal to the extent of their core that is of minuscule size but grow with the addition of *bhootas*, the physical matter, during the creation. This addition is termed as birth. Hence there is no contradiction from the *veda* that speaks of an eternal existence to *indirias* and hence, it stands proved that they also are created.

॥ ॐ तत्प्राक् श्रुतेश्च ॐ ॥ २ ॥

tatpraak shrutescha - 2

अत्र प्रकृतप्राणान्तर्गतमनोजन्मसमर्थनात्सङ्गतिः । मनः किं जनिमन्नवेति सन्देहे नेति प्राप्तम् । “नित्यं मनोऽनादित्वात् न ह्यमनाः पुमान् तिष्ठत्यनित्यान्यन्यानि” इति (गौपवन) श्रुतेः । अस्याश्चेन्द्रियान्तराणामनित्यत्वमुक्त्वा मनसो विशिष्य नित्यत्वोक्त्या विशेषश्रुतित्वेन, एतद्विरोधात् मनोजन्मश्रुतिबलेन प्रागिवोपपत्तेर-युक्तत्वात् । मनसः सादित्वे तन्मूलसंसारस्यापि सादित्वापत्तेश्च जन्मश्रुतिः अमानमिति ॥

This chapter discusses the eternity of *manas* – mind. Mind is eternal, for *veda* itself says so. It says “Since *manas* is not born, it is eternal”. It also provides a reasoning - “*Jeeva* never stays without *manas*; other *indriyas* are transient – *anitya*”. Since this vedic statement clearly segregates *manas* from other *indriyas* and specifically mentions it to be eternal, the accommodative meaning as told in the previous chapter based on the other *sruti* (vedic statement) that speaks of an origin to *indriyas*, cannot be adopted here. This apart, if *manas* is agreed to have an origin, even this *samsara* (cycle of births and deaths) that is caused by *manas* should also be considered as transient, which is not true. Hence the *sruti* that speaks of an origin for *manas* is invalid.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ मनस्सर्वेन्द्रियाणि चेति इन्द्रियेभ्यः पृथक् मनसो जन्मोक्त्या विशेषश्रुत्या मनोजन्मसिद्धेः । अल्पोपचयकारणादिति (वायुप्रोक्त) स्मृत्या इन्द्रियान्तरोपचयादस्यानादित्वाविधातेनाल्पोपचयहेतुना नित्यं मन इत्यादिश्रुत्युपपत्तेः । बन्धसादित्वापत्त्यभावाच्च उत्पत्तिमदेव मनः इति ॥ २ ॥

There is also another *sruti* that speaks of the origin of *manas* specifically - “*manah sarvendriyaani ca*”. The distinction shown by the earlier *sruti* in mentioning *manas* as eternal is with reference to the extent of *upachaya*, growth that *manas* gets vis-a-vis other *indriyas*. The growth received on account of addition of *bhootas* is very little for *manas* as compared to that of others. This

fact is mentioned by *vaayu-prokta smriti*. Had *manas* been not eternal, even the *samsaara* should have been so.

Hence, it is concluded that *manas* has an origin.

॥ ॐ तत्पूर्वकत्वाद्वाचः ॐ ॥ ३ ॥

tatpoorvakatvaad vaachah - 3

अत्र प्राणान्तर्गतमनसो वाग्जन्माक्षिप्य समर्थनात्सङ्गतिः । वागिन्द्रियमुत्पत्ति-
मन्नवेति सन्देहे नेति प्राप्तम् । "वाग्वाव नित्या नह्येषोत्पद्यतेऽस्यां हि
श्रुतिरवतिष्ठते" इति (पौष्यायण) श्रुतेः सदा वेदोच्चारणसामर्थ्यरूपश्रुत्याश्रयत्व-
रूपवाक्यशेषोक्तयुक्तेश्च । एतद्युक्तिविरोधेन सूक्ष्मरूपोपचितरूपपरे जन्माजन्म-
श्रुती इति निरस्तम् । नित्यं वेदोच्चारणशक्तस्योपचयवैयर्थ्यात् । श्रुत्याश्रयत्वो-
क्त्यैव वाक्शब्दः श्रुतिपरः नेन्द्रियपर इति प्रत्युक्तम् । अतस्सर्वेन्द्रियाणि चेति
वाग्जन्मश्रुतिरमानमिति ॥

The discussion in this chapter is about the eternity of the sense of speech *Vaak indriya*. *Poushaayana* text of *veda* says "vaak is eternal. It is never born. *Vedas* stay in this *vaak*". Staying in *vaak* is in the sense of *vaak* being able to spell out *vedas*. Since *vedas* are eternal, their container also needs to be eternal. It cannot even be said that *vaak* is eternal in its subtle core form and is born through additions of *bhootas*. For, the eternity of *vaak* is derived out of its capability to utter *vedas*. If that is served through the subtle core itself, where is the need of its further manifestation through additions of *bhootas*. Hence even such a classification as was applied in the chapter (2-4-1) does not hold good here. The word *vaak* here, refers to *vaak indriya* (sense of speech) and not *vedas*, for the statement is on *vedas* staying in *vaak*. *Vedas* cannot stay in

vedas. Hence the vedic text that speaks of an origin for *vaak* is invalid.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ "मन एव पूर्वरूपं वागुत्तररूपम्" इति श्रुतौ (ऐ.आ.३-१-१) वाचः मनःकारणकत्वश्रवणात् । वाक्शब्दस्य च वाचा व्याहरतीति पूर्ववाक्यबलेन "मनसो वाव वागुत्पद्यते वाचो व्याहरणम्" इति श्रुत्यन्तरे चोत्तरवाक्यबलेन इन्द्रियपरत्वात् । "वागिन्द्रियस्य नित्यत्वं श्रुतिसन्निधि-योग्यता" इति (वायुप्रोक्त) स्मृत्या नित्यवेदसन्निधियोग्यतामात्राभिप्रायेण उपचारेण नित्यत्वश्रुत्युपपत्तेः । तदुच्चारणशक्तये चोपचयसार्थक्यात् । जन्मश्रुत्योत्पत्तिमदेव वागिन्द्रियमिति ॥३॥

Vaak indriya has a birth. *Veda* says "*manas* precedes *vaak*". This means, *manas* causes *vaak*. Everything that has a cause has a birth. In the previous sentence (that is preceding "*mana eva poorva roopam..*"), it is said that a thought is formed in mind and then it is uttered through *vaak*. In another vedic text it is said "*vaak* takes its birth from *manas* and utterance is through *vaak*". These two vedic statements prove that the word *vaak* is not referring to *vedas* but to the sense of speech.

The expression of eternity to *vaak* is only in the secondary sense on account of its proximity to the eternal *vedas*. The subtle core *vaak indriya* is eternal and it becomes capable of uttering *vedas* through the addition of *bhootas*. Hence it is both eternal and has a birth as described in chapter (2-4-1) above. Hence it stands proved that *vaak indriya* has a birth.

॥ ॐ सप्त गतेर्विशेषितत्वाच्च ॐ ॥ ४ ॥

sapta gater-visheshitatvaaccha - 4

॥ ॐ हस्तादयस्तु स्थितेऽतो नैवम् ॐ ॥

hastaadayastu sthite ato naivam;

प्राणानां धर्मितामाश्रित्य जनिश्चिन्तिता । सङ्ख्यारूपधर्माश्रयात् जनिश्चिन्त्यत इति सङ्गतिः । प्राणाः किं सप्त उत द्वादशेत्यनिर्णय उत द्वादशेतिनिर्णय इति सन्देहे अनिर्णय इति प्राप्तम् । "सप्त प्राणाः प्रभवन्ति" इति "द्वादश वा एते प्राणाः द्वादशमासाः द्वादशादित्या" इति विरुद्धसङ्ख्यावगमकश्रुतिद्वयात् । न च प्राणानां द्वादशत्वेऽपि शते पञ्चाशन्वयायेन सप्तत्वश्रुतिर्घटत इति वाच्यम् । अवच्छेदकाभावे सप्तत्वाद्युक्तेरयोगात् । एतैस्सह पञ्चानामपाठे हेत्वभावेन तदभावप्रतीतेश्च । "सप्तैव मारुता बाह्ये प्राणास्सप्त तथात्मनि" इति (स्कान्द) स्मृत्युक्त्या अभिमानिनां सप्तत्वेन तदभिमतानामपि तथात्वं अभिमान्यभिमन्यमानयोः समसङ्ख्याकत्वनियमादित्युक्त्या सप्तत्वश्रुतेः प्राबल्यवत्, द्वादशत्वश्रुतेरपि द्वादश मासा इत्यादिवाक्यशेषोक्तप्रागुक्त्युक्त्युपेतत्वेन प्राबल्यात्, वाक्यशेषोदितानां मासानां द्वादशादित्यादिदेवताकत्वेन इन्द्रियाणामपि ता एव देवता इति भावेनैव द्वादशमासा इत्याद्युक्तेरिति ॥

While the discussion in the previous chapter was on the birth of *indriyas* by virtue of them being so, their birth is discussed here based on their count. Some texts say their number as Seven and some other as Twelve. Whether there can be a conclusion on the number or not is the subject of discussion. There cannot be a conclusion. For, some texts say "Seven *indriyas* are born" and some others say "*Indriyas* are twelve in number like twelve months, twelve *adityas*" etc. Well, if we say there are hundred cows, it also means there are fifty. Similarly, why not we consider twelve to include seven? No, with no demarcator available, we cannot take the count as seven while twelve exists. If we are to say they are seven when in fact they are twelve, it would mean the balance of five do not exist. *Skaanda puraana* says there are only seven (*indriyas*) outside the body and seven within it. This means there are seven regulating deities and an equal number of *indriyas*. It is logical to have an equal number for regulators and the

regulated. Hence the text that speaks of seven as the number is strong enough to present its case. However, even the other one that speaks the number to be 12 is equally strong. For, it speaks of the deities regulating months and *aadityas* who are in turn the regulating deities of *indriyaas* as well. Thus going by the rule of an equality of number between the regulator and regulated, the count of *indriyas* should be twelve. Hence the indecision.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ प्राणानां द्वादशत्वेऽपि "गुहाशयां निहिताः सप्त सप्त" इति (मु. २-१-८) वाक्यशेषोक्तज्ञानेन्द्रियत्वावच्छेदकविवक्षया श्रोत्रचक्षस्त्वग्रसनघ्राण-मनोबुद्धीनां सप्तत्वोक्त्युपपत्तेः । वाक्पाणिपादपायूपस्थानां कर्मेन्द्रियत्वरूप-वैलक्षण्येन सप्तत्वश्रुतौ सप्तभिस्सह पाठाभावोपपत्त्या तन्मात्रेण इतरेषामभावशङ्काऽयोगेन द्वादशत्वश्रुत्या द्वादशेति निर्णय एवेति ॥४॥

Though the count of *indriyas* is twelve, the sensory *indriyas* are seven as stated in *mundaka upanishat* that says "those who are embedded in the body are seven and seven only". Hence there is a demarcator to isolate seven from the whole lot of twelve. These seven are *srotr*, *cakshu*, *tvak*, *rasana*, *ghraana*, *manas*, *buddhi* – ear, eyes, skin, tongue, nose, mind and intelligence. The other five viz. *vaak*, *paani*, *paada*, *paayu*, *upashtha* – speech, hands, legs, excretory organs, sex organs are *karmendriyas* (motor organs) – those engage in actions. Hence they are not counted along with *jnaanendriyas*, the sensory organs and this should not be the reason to infer their non-existence. Hence the number of *indriyas* stands decided at twelve.

॥ ॐ अणवश्च ॐ ॥ ५ ॥

Anavascha – 5

पूर्वत्र प्राणानां सङ्ख्या विचारिता । अत्र तत्परिमाणं चिन्त्यत इति सङ्गतिः । प्राणाः किं अणवः उत व्याप्ता इति सन्देहे व्याप्ता इति प्राप्तम् । "दिवीव

चक्षुराततम्” इति (क.१-२२-२०) व्याप्तत्वश्रुतेः । विष्णोर्व्याप्तत्वे दृष्टान्तत्वेन चक्षुर्व्याप्तेरुक्त्या दूरश्रवणदर्शनस्मरणादियुक्त्या चास्याः प्राबल्याच्च सुदृढस्यैव दृष्टान्तीकरणाच्च । "अणुभिः पश्यति" इत्यणुत्वश्रुतिस्तु (कौण्डिन्य) प्रबलव्याप्तत्वश्रुतिबाधादमानमिति ।

After discussing the count of *indriyas* in the previous chapter, their size is being discussed here. Whether *indriyas* have an atomic size (*aNu*) or are wide spread in size (*vyaapta*). *Katha upanishat* quotes the size of *indriyas* as *vyaapta* to illustrate how God is wide spread. Something can be shown as an illustration only when that is known for sure by all. Hence *indriyas* are *vyaapta* in size. This apart, we know pretty well that eyes see the objects at a distance. Ears hear the sound from a far off place. These things are possible only when they are in contact with such objects. Hence, it is logical to say that *indriyas* are *vyaapta*. Since the vedic text “*diveeva chakshuraatatam*” is supported by the aforesaid reasoning it is strong enough to invalidate the other vedic text that says “*aNubhih pashyati*” which indicates *indriyas* to be of atomic size.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ "तद्यथा ह्यणुनश्चक्षुः प्रकाशो व्यातत एवमेवास्य पुरुषस्य प्रकाशो व्याततः अणुर्ह्येवैष पुरुषो भवति" (शाण्डिल्य श्रुति) इति श्रुत्या आत्मानुत्वादौ चक्षुषो दृष्टान्तत्वोक्त्या विशेषश्रुतित्वेन च बलवत्त्वात् अणुत्वाद्युक्तेः । स्वरूपेण प्राणानामणुत्वेऽपि तेजसा व्याप्तत्वोक्त्या दूरश्रवणदर्शनाद्युपपत्तेः । सामान्यतो व्याप्तित्वश्रुतेरपि प्रकाशव्याप्तिपरत्वोपपत्तेः । प्राणानां स्वरूपतो व्याप्तौ सदा सर्वापरोक्षप्रसङ्गेन सुप्त्यभावापाताच्च अणव एव प्राणा इति ॥५॥

Another vedic text (*shaandilya sruti*) says “though *jeeva* is of atomic size he is spread across through their luminance the way *indriyas* that are of atomic size are spread through their luminance”. This clearly explains how *indriyas* though are of atomic size are capable of perceiving objects at a distance. They

are spread through their *prakaasha* – aura. Had *indriyas* themselves been *vyaapta*, it would have resulted in continuous flow of information of everything at all times, which is not true. Such a continuous flow of information would have meant no sleep to the individuals.

॥ ॐ श्रेष्ठश्च ॐ ॥ ६ ॥

shreshtashca - 6

॥ ॐ न वायुक्रिये पृथगुपदेशात् ॐ ॥

na vaayukriye prithagupadeshaat;

प्राणानां चिन्तनानन्तरं तत्प्रेरकमुख्यप्राणचिन्तात्रेति सङ्गतिः । मुख्यप्राणः किं जनिमान्नवेति सन्देहे नेति प्राप्तम् । "नैष प्राण उदेति" इति श्रुतेः "यत्प्राप्तिर्यत्प-
रित्यागः उत्पत्तिर्मरणं तथा" इति स्मृत्युक्त्या अखिलोत्पत्तिमृत्युहेतुत्वेन
उत्पत्त्याद्ययोग इति युक्त्युपेतत्वेन "स प्राणमसृजते"त्यादिकेवलजनि-
श्रुतितोऽस्याः प्राबल्यात् । जनिश्रुतिस्थप्राणपदस्य "चेष्टायां बाह्यवायौ च"
इत्यादेः चेष्टादिवाचित्वेनाप्युपपत्तेश्च । न चैतत् "एतेन मातरिश्वा व्याख्यातः"
(ब्र.सू. २-३-८) इत्यनेनैव गतार्थम् । तत्र बाह्यमुख्यवायुरूपस्य जननोक्तावपि
इहाध्यात्मिक प्राणरूपस्य तन्न युक्तम् । तस्य अखिलजनिमृतिहेतुत्वात् ।
तादृशस्य दुःखहेतुस्वजननाय प्रवृत्त्ययोगादित्यधिकाशङ्क्या अस्योत्थानादिति ॥

Origin of *mukhya praana*, who is the regulator of all senses is discussed in this chapter. Whether or not he has an origin is the doubt. He does not have a birth, for *sruti* itself says "this *praana* is not born, nor would he die etc". This is supported by the reasoning provided by another script that says "when anyone is considered as born with his (*praana*'s) entry and dead on his exit, how can he be considered as having a birth?". The vedic text that says "*sa praanam asrijata*" - he created *praana* is a plain text without any support for it. Hence it is not strong enough to counter the other

text that has the support of reasoning. It can also be taken to mean “*chesta* – action” or “*baahya vaayu* – the external air” by the word “*praana*” in it based on the usage “*chestaayaam baahyavaayou cha*” etc. In that case, the text that says *praana* has a birth speaks of actions or of the external air and that which says *praana* does not have a birth speaks of the internal *vaayu* which is responsible for life. It is for this reason, this chapter is different from the earlier one where birth of *vaayu* has been discussed (2.3.8). The rule of obtaining a body being considered as birth cannot be applied here. How would this *praana* who causes life to others acquire a body for his own selves only to suffer its deficiencies?

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ "सौक्ष्म्येण ह वा एषोऽवतिष्ठते स्थूलत्वेनोदेति" इति (गौपवन) श्रुतौ प्राणस्य स्वभावतो देहादितश्चानुत्पत्त्युत्पत्त्युक्त्या जननाजननश्रुत्योः तत्परत्वेनाविरोधात् । जन्मश्रुतिस्थप्राणपदस्य च तद्वाक्यशेषे "प्राणाच्छ्रद्धा खं वायुर्ज्योतिरापः पृथिवीन्द्रियं मनोऽन्नमन्नाद्वीर्यं तपो मन्त्राः कर्मे"ति चेष्टादेः पृथगुक्त्या चेष्टादिपरत्वायोगेन मुख्यप्राणपरत्वात् जनिमानेव मुख्यप्राणः । तस्य स्वतोऽजन्मयोगेऽपि अतिमाहात्म्यवद्विष्णुजातत्वस्य स प्राणमिति श्रुतावेवोक्त्या ततस्तस्य जननोपपत्तेरिति ॥६॥

Goupavana sruti says “*Praana* stays eternal in his minuscule form. He is born in manifest form”. Thus the vedic statements that speak of his eternity and birth speak so with reference to his minuscule form and the manifest one. Hence they pose no conflict. The argument that birth of *praana* as mentioned in the quoted *sruti* refers to actions or external air is also not true. For, the subsequent part of the said statement (*sa praanam asrijata*) speaks of birth of other entities like *shraddha*, *aakaasha*, *vaayu* (air) and so on including *karma* (actions). Since there is a separate mention of air and actions, the word *praana* cannot be taken to mean them.

As regards acquiring a body, *praana* does so not on his own but on being provided of it by God whose magnificent glory includes regulating the all regulator *praana*.

॥ ॐ चक्षुरादिवत्तु तत्सहशिष्ट्यादिभ्यः ॐ ॥ ७ ॥

chakshuraadivattu tat-saha-shishtyaadibhyah - 7

॥ ॐ अकरणत्वाच्च न दोषस्तथा हि दर्शयति ॐ ॥

akaranatvaaccha na doshah tathaa hi darshayati;

प्रागुक्तप्राणस्य जनिरिह पूर्वपक्षे स्वातन्त्र्यादाक्षिप्यत इति सङ्गतिः । अत्र मुख्यप्राणः किं स्वतन्त्रः परतन्त्रो वेति सन्देहः । स्वतन्त्र इति प्राप्तम् । "न प्राणः किञ्चिदाश्रितः" इति (आग्निवेश्य) श्रुतेः ॥ "यदाश्रयादस्य चेष्टा" (महाभारत) इत्यादिस्मृत्युक्त्या अखिलजगच्चेष्टकत्वमाहात्म्यवत्त्वेन अनन्याश्रयत्वयुक्त्युपेतत्वेन अस्याः "प्राणः परवशे स्थितः" इति (पैङ्गीश्रुति) पारतन्त्र्यश्रुतितः प्राबल्याच्च । स्वातन्त्र्यश्रुतियुक्तिविरोधादेव प्रागुक्तजन्मश्रुतीनामप्रामाण्यात् । "स्थूलत्वेनोदेति" (गौपवन) इति श्रुतेश्च लीलाविग्रहग्रहणपरत्वेनोपपत्तेश्च प्रागुक्तजनिरप्ययुक्तेति ॥

The birth of *mukhya praana* is discussed again here in the context of him being an independent entity. Whether or not he is independent is the question. *Aagniveshya sruti* says *praana* is not dependent on anyone. This is supported by the statement in *Mahaabhaarata* that says while every activity in the universe is because of him, how can he be considered as dependent on anyone? Hence this is stronger than the vedic text that says "*praanah paravashe sthitah*". Hence the quoted text in the previous chapter that speaks of an origin to *praana* is invalid as it contradicts independence of *praana*.

As an independent entity, it is possible that *praana* playfully picks up some physical body for himself. Hence the text that speaks of him as born for the reason of acquiring a body has no contradiction in the matter.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ मुख्यप्राणः परतन्त्रः, "सर्वं होवैतत्परमेऽवतिष्ठते प्राणश्च प्राणाश्च" इति चक्षुरादिप्राणैः सह तद्वदेव तस्येश्वरवशत्व(गीपवन)श्रुतेः। अस्याश्च "यतो नैवेश्वरद्वयम्" इति वचनोक्तेश्वरद्वयायोगरूपयुक्तिसध्रीचीनत्वेन प्राबल्यात् । "प्राणस्यैतद्वशे सर्वं प्राणः परवशे स्थितः" (पैङ्गीश्रुतिः) इति विशेषणाच्च । स्वातन्त्र्यश्रुतियुक्त्योस्तु "अवान्तरेश्वरत्वेन तस्येश्वरवचो भवेत्" इत्यादेः तदनन्येश्वरत्वावान्तरेश्वरत्वपरत्वात् । चक्षुरादिसाम्येश्वरवशत्वोक्तावपि सुषुप्तौ जीवप्रयत्नाभावे च चक्षुरादीनां मुख्यप्राणस्य व्यापारदृष्ट्यदृष्टिभ्यां कर्तृप्रयोज्यत्वाप्रयोज्यत्वदृष्ट्या "तानि ह वा एतानि सर्वाणि करणानि" (माण्डव्यश्रुति) इत्यादिश्रुत्या च करणाकरणत्वाख्यवैलक्षण्यादस्यातिशयेन अवान्तरेश्वरत्वस्योपपत्तेश्चेति । "सोऽध्यक्षे" (ब्र.सू.४-२-४) इत्यतोऽगतत्व-मस्य तत्रैव वक्ष्यते ॥७॥

Mukhya praana is not independent. *Veda* says "everything stays within God – *praana* and *indriyas*". Since *praana* is quoted along with *indriyas*, it is clear that he is as dependent on God as *indriyas* are. As told in scripts that there cannot be two independent lords, *praana* cannot be considered as independent, which in turn would mean two independent lords. *Paingee sruti* puts it in clear terms - "everything is under the control of *praana* and *praana* is under the control of God".

The vedic statements and the reasoning in favour of *praana* being independent would only mean him a subordinate lord, subordinated only to *Vishnu*. Though *praana* is said to be as dependent on *Vishnu* as other *indriyas* are, the difference lies in the fact that while other *indriyas* are active only when *jeeva* is awake, *praana* continues to be so even when *jeeva* is fast asleep. Other

indriyas are activated through an effort of *jeeva* while *praana* remains independent of it. It is in this sense that *maandavya sruti* calls all other *indriyas* as tools of *jeeva* and that *praana* as not. Hence *praana* is superior to all others and remains a lord of everything while himself being a subordinate to *Vishnu*.

॥ ॐ पञ्चवृत्तिर्मनोवद्व्यपदिश्यते ॐ ॥ ८ ॥

Pancha-vritti-manovad-vyapadishyate - 8

मुख्यप्राणप्रसङ्गसन्निधापिताः प्राणादयोऽत्र चिन्त्यन्त इति सङ्गतिः । प्राणादयः पञ्च मुख्यदासत्वेन स्वरूपत्वेन वा निर्णेतं शक्यन्ते न वेति सन्देहे नेति प्राप्तम् । "सर्वे वा एते मुख्यदासा" इति दासत्वश्रुतेः । "एष प्राणः इतरान्प्राणान् पृथक्पृथगेव सन्निधत्ते" (ष.प्र. ३-३) इत्यादिश्रुत्या "प्राणापानादयस्सर्वे" इत्यादिस्मृत्या चोक्त्या तदाज्ञया कर्मकारित्वादिति युक्त्युपेतत्वेन प्राबल्यात् । "मुख्यस्यैव स्वरूपाणि प्राणाद्या" इति (गौपवन) स्वरूपश्रुतेरपि स्वरूपत्वसाधकव्यक्तसद्गुणत्वयुक्त्युपेतत्वेन प्राबल्यात् । श्रूयते च "पायूपस्थेऽपानं चक्षुःश्रोत्रे मुखनासिकाभ्यां प्राणः स्वयं प्रतिष्ठते" (ष.प्र. ३-४) इत्यादौ व्यक्तसद्गुणत्वं तेषाम् । न ह्येतद्वासेषु युक्तं स्वामिभृत्यभावायोगात् । वस्तुनि विकल्पायोगेन श्रुत्योर्विरुद्धार्थत्वेनाप्रामाण्यादिति ॥

After discussing *mukhya praana*, it is now relevant to discuss other *praanas* known as *praana*, *apaana*, *vyaana*, *udaana* and *samaana*. These are known to carry out the essential services like distribution of digested food to each and every cell of the body, disposal of waste materials through urine and stools etc.

The question here is whether there can be a conclusion as to whether these five *praanas* are five forms of *mukhya praana* or different from him and are his subordinates. *Sruti* says "*sarve vaa ete mukhyadaasaah*" - all these are servants of *mukhya praana*. This is supported by the reasoning that they are all assigned

various tasks by *mukhya praana* and are obedient to him. So says *shatprashna upanishat* – This *mukhya praana* assigned different areas to all other *praanas*. Another text by name *vaayuprokta* specifically states that these *praana*, *apaana* etc are servants of *mukhya praana* and are obedient to him. Hence it is prominent.

There is another *sruti* that says “*mukhyasyaiva svaroopaanī praanaadyā*” - These *praana* etc are forms of very own *mukhya praana*. There is also a strong reason in support of this. That is, these *praana*, *apaana* etc are staying in specific places and discharging some special tasks. Servants cannot discharge such tasks. The tasks handled by them are:

Praana – stays in eyes, ears, mouth and nose and activates them.

Apaana – enables excretion, urination and sexual acts.

Vyaana – stays in all nerves, joints and muscles taking care of physical strength and all actions.

Udaana – stays in *brahma naadi* and carries *jeeva* to heaven and hell etc on death.

Samaana – enables distribution of digested food to all living cells in the body.

Since the said individuals cannot be considered as forms of one and the same *mukhya praana* and also as his subordinates, both the contradictory vedic texts should be considered as invalid.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ “अथ पञ्चवृत्त्यैतत्प्रवर्तते” इत्यादिश्रुतौ मनोदृष्टान्तेन पञ्चशब्देन दासत्वेन पञ्चस्वरूपत्वेन च मुख्यप्राणस्योक्त्या पृथगुभयविधत्वाङ्गीकारेण श्रुत्योर्युक्तियुक्तयोरविरोधेनाप्रामाण्याभावात् । “इतरान् प्राणान्” इति दासानुपक्रम्योक्तव्यक्तसद्गुणत्वस्य च “अशेषगुणपूर्णानि मुख्यरूपाणि पञ्च च । तद्दासाः पञ्च चान्येऽपि प्राणाद्याः सद्गुणैर्युताः” इति श्रुत्या स्वरूपतद्दासानां तारतम्येनोपपत्त्या स्वामिभृत्यभावाविरोधात् । इतरान् प्राणानिति दासानुपक्रम्य

पायूपस्थेऽपानमित्यादिनोक्तं व्यक्तसद्गुणत्वं दासानामपि किञ्चिद्युक्तमिति प्राणादयो द्वेधा निर्णेतुं शक्यन्त एवेति ॥८॥

Veda says “*praana* functions in five forms” and illustrates such functionality with that of *manas*. With the given illustration, it becomes clear that *mukhya praana* has his own five forms in the name of *praana* etc and there is another set of five with the same names and these five are dependent on the aforesaid five forms of *mukhya praana*. In the sense, *praana* who is one of the forms of *mukhya praana* gives birth to and regulates another *praana* who is subordinate to him. Similarly *apana*, *vyaana*, *udana* and *samaana*. Hence there is no conflict in vedic statement as presented in *poorvapaksha*.

Shatprashna upanishat, where it is described that *mukhya praana* allocates tasks to *praana* and others continues to say that these subordinate entities take care of the functionalities as described above. Thus, it is perfectly valid to say that the subordinate deities also are capable of performing the respective special tasks. Another vedic script makes it clear that there are five forms of *mukhya praana* that are full of qualities. There are other five deities of the same names and they are also having the referred special qualities. This makes it clear that there are two rungs of functionaries. The top one is made of the forms of *mukhya praana* and the lower one is of other deities by the same names. Since one is the master and another his servant, there is no conflict in performance.

This *sootra* has quoted the status of *manas* as an example to drive home the concept of two sets for the same functionality. The five forms of *manas* regulate different functionalities as under:

Manas – Doubt and dilemma.

Buddhi – Decision

Ahankaara – Sense of ownership in what is not owned.

Chittam – Recollection

Chetana – That which spreads across the entire body and connects to *jeeva*.

Even these have two sets. One set being the forms of *manas* and the other set that consists of subordinates.

॥ॐ अणुश्च ॐ ॥ ९ ॥

anushcha - 9

प्रागुक्तप्राणादिप्रेरकत्वाख्याधिकसद्गुणवत्प्राणस्य विभुत्वमप्यस्त्विति शङ्कना-
त्सङ्गतिः । प्राणो व्याप्तोऽणुर्वेति सन्देहे व्याप्त इति प्राप्तम् ॥ “प्राण एवाधस्तात्”
इत्यादिव्याप्तत्वश्रुत्या “यतस्सर्वं जगद्व्याप्य तिष्ठति प्राण” इत्यादि (वायुप्रोक्त)
स्मृत्युक्तसर्वजगद्व्यापकत्वयुक्त्या “प्राणोवाणुः” इति (सौत्रायण) अणुत्वश्रुतितः
प्रबलया व्याप्तत्वोक्तेः । न चेयं वैष्णवत्वेन सावकाशा । “महान् वै मुख्यप्राणः येन
व्याप्तं चराचरम्” इत्यादिश्रुत्यन्तरे स्पष्टं मुख्यप्राणस्य च व्याप्तत्वप्रतीतिश्चेति ॥

The discussion here is on whether or not *mukhya praana*, who was referred to in the previous chapter as having superior special qualities is of miniature size or omnipresent. *Veda* says *praana* is above, he is below, he is in the middle and he is everywhere. Another text says “the universe is stable because, *praana* who is spread everywhere is supporting it”. Thus the vedic text that speaks of *praana* being omnipresent has a supportive reasoning and hence is strong enough to oppose another vedic text that says “*praano vaa anuh*” - *praana* is of miniature size.

Though the word *praana* also means *Vishnu*, such a meaning cannot be adopted here to say that the one who is omnipresent is *vishnu* and not *mukhya praana*. For, another vedic text puts it very clearly using the word “*mukhya praana*” while describing him to

be of large size occupying everything mobile and stationary, indicating the omnipresence of *praana*.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ "स वा एष प्राणोऽणुर्महान्नाम" (कौण्डिण्य) इत्यादिश्रुत्या देहान्तर्बहिर्वर्तमानप्राणवायुशब्दितरूपभेदेन अणुत्वमहत्त्वयोर्व्यवस्थोक्तेः प्राणो अणुरेव "अणुर्वै मुख्यप्राणः यदुत्क्रामति नाडीभिः" इति अणुत्वश्रुतेरपि नाडीसञ्चारित्वयुक्तियुक्तत्वेन बलवत्त्वादिति ॥९॥

Some more texts of veda like *koundinya sruti* makes it clear that *praana* is both of mini size as well as omnipresent. He is of miniature size in his forms named *praana* that are internal to the bodies of all living beings. Externally, he is spread everywhere in the name of *vaayu*. Another *sruti* says "*mukhya praana* is of miniature size, for he ejects from the bodies through the nerves.

Thus there is no conflict in describing *praana* as of miniature size and of large size spread everywhere.

॥ ॐ ज्योतिराद्यधिष्ठानं तु तदामननात् ॐ ॥ १० ॥

jyotiraady-adhishthaanam tu tadaamananaat - 10

॥ ॐ प्राणवता शब्दात् ॐ ॥ ॥ ॐ तस्य च नित्यत्वात् ॐ ॥

praanavataa shabdaat; tasya cha nityatvaat;

प्राणान् मुख्यप्राणं च निरूप्य इह तेषां कं प्रति करणत्वमिति चिन्त्यत इति संगतिः । चक्षुरादीन्द्रियाणि किं जीवकरणानि उत ब्रह्मकरणानीति विशये जीवकरणानीति प्राप्तम् । "जीवस्य करणान्याहुः प्राणान्" इति (सौत्रायण) श्रुत्या जीववशत्वेनानुभूयमानत्वयुक्तियुक्तत्वेन, "ब्रह्मणो वा एतानि करणानीति ब्रह्मकरणत्वश्रुतितः प्राबलयात् जीवकरणत्वोक्तेरिति ॥

After discussing *indriyas* and *praana*, it is now time to know whom does these *indriyas* belong to - Whether the sense organs like eyes that exist in everyone, are the instruments of God or of *jeeva*? *Sruti* says they are instruments of *jeeva*. So is the experience of everyone.

The eyes, nose etc that I have belong to me. They facilitate seeing, smelling etc for me. The *sruti* is backed by this experience of everyone and is therefore strong enough to oppose another one that says that all the sense *indriyas* are instruments of *Brahma*.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ "यश्चक्षुषि तिष्ठन्" (बृ.५-७-१८) इत्यादिश्रुत्या चक्षुरादीन्द्रि-
यस्य ब्रह्माधिष्ठानत्वोक्त्या तत्प्रयोज्यत्वोक्तेः तथा "यस्तेजसि तिष्ठन्"
इत्यादिना तेजःप्रभृतिभूतप्रेरकत्वोक्त्या तदंशभूतचक्षुरादेरपि ब्रह्मप्रयोज्यत्वमिति
युक्तिबलात् तथा "यः प्राणे तिष्ठन्" इत्यादिश्रुतेः सर्वेन्द्रियप्रेरकप्राणप्रेरकत्व-
युक्तिबलाच्च ब्रह्मकरणान्येवेन्द्रियाणि । मुख्यस्येशप्रयोज्यत्वेऽपि "न जीवापेक्षया
मुख्यं" इति (वाराह)स्मृतेः जीवं प्रत्यकरणत्वं युक्तम् इन्द्रियाणां जीवकरणत्व-
श्रुतिस्तु "एष ह्यनेनात्मना चक्षुषा दर्शयति" (भाल्लवेय) इत्यादिश्रुतौ "करणैः
कारणं ब्रह्म" इति (वाराह)स्मृतौ च ब्रह्मणः स्वकरणेनैव चक्षुरादिना जीवं प्रति
दर्शनादि कारयति इत्युक्त्या चैत्रीयकुठारस्य मैत्रकरणत्वोक्तिरिव जीवं प्रति
क्रियासाधनत्वमात्राभिप्राया । "करणैर्वाव न वियुज्यते" इति (गौपवन) श्रुत्या
जीवकरणसम्बन्धस्य अनादिनित्यत्वात् चैत्रीयकुठारे बहकालसम्बन्धिनि
मैत्रीयत्वोक्तिरिवोपचारेण जीवकरणत्वाभिप्राया वा । जीववशत्वानुभवोऽपि
आभिमानिकतया युक्त इति ॥

Going by the *sruti* that says *Brahma* stays in *indriyas* and activates them, it is clear that they are used by God and hence are his instruments. A similar expression is also there in vedic texts for *tejas*. *Indriyas* are nothing but specks of *tejas*. Even this confirms that *indriyas* are under the control of and are used by God. This is the case even for *praana* who is the enabler of *indriyas*. Thus even *praana* is an instrument of God and for the same reason, *indriyas*

that are subordinate to *praana* are for sure the instruments of God. While *mukhya praana* is also an instrument in the hands of God like other *indriyas*, he is not counted as an instrument of *jeeva*. For, he is not dependent on the desire of *jeevas* for his action but acts only at the instance of God. Whereas other *indriyas* are deployed by God as per the desire of *jeevas*. He makes them see through his eyes etc. So says *sruti* “he makes them see through his eyes”. *Varaha puraana* says “since God gets all tasks done by *jeevas* using his *indriyas* as per the desire of such *jeevas*, they are called their instruments”. This is something like one Mr. Maitra is using the axe of Mr. Chaitra to cut a tree. Then, though Chitra is the owner of the axe, it is now the tool of Maitra. Similarly, though *indriyas* belong to God, they are used by *jeevas* and hence they are called their instruments. There is another reason to say that *indriyas* belong to *jeevas* – These *indriyas* are staying with their respective *jeevas* since eternity. If something remains with a person for long periods, though not belonging to him, it is treated as if it belongs to him, as in the case of a person staying in a rented house for say over a decade, people start calling it as his house. Similar is the case with *indriyas*.

The experience that *indriyas* belong to *jeeva* is because they get deployed (by God) as per their desire.

॥ ॐ त इन्द्रियाणि तद्व्यपदेशादन्यत्र श्रेष्ठात् ॐ ॥ ११ ॥

ta indriyaani tadvyaapadeshaad-anyatra shreshthaat - 11

॥ ॐ भेदश्रुतेः ॐ ॥ ॐ वैलक्षण्याच्च ॐ ॥

bhedashruteh; vailakshanyaaccha;

पूर्वोक्तं मुख्यप्राणस्य जीवं प्रत्यकरणत्वमयुक्तम् । तस्यापीन्द्रियत्वेन तं प्रति करणत्वात् इति शङ्कनात्सङ्गतिः । प्राक् प्रकृतमिन्द्रियत्वं किं सर्वेषां प्राणानामुत मुख्यप्राणादन्येषां द्वादशानामेवेति संदेहः । सर्वेषामिति पूर्वः पक्षः । “प्राणा वा

इन्द्रियाणि" इति (पौत्रायणश्रुति) सामान्यतः सर्वेषामिन्द्रियत्वश्रुतेः । तस्याः सामान्यत्वेऽपि इदं द्रवणरूपयुक्त्युपेतत्वेन "द्वादशैवेन्द्रियाण्याहुः" इति विशेष (काषायण) श्रुतितोऽपि बलवत्त्वात् । द्वादशानामेवेन्द्रियत्वाध्यवसायस्य दुष्करत्वाच्च । न हि तेषु त्रयोदशसु अन्यतमस्येन्द्रियत्वनिवारणं शक्यम् । सर्वेषामपीशवशत्वाविशेषादिति ॥

The statement in the previous chapter that *mukhya praana* is not an instrument is not true. For, he is also an *indriya* and hence he should also be counted as *indriya*.

Poutraayana Sruti says all *praanas* are *indriyas*. Though this is a generic statement and hence not as strong by itself, it is supported by the reasoning that these *praanas* are called as *indriyas* because of their nature to run towards the objects (*idam prati dravanam*). Hence it is strong enough to resist the opposition from another *sruti* that says there are only 12 *indriyas*. However, there are a total of 13 *indriyas* viz. five sensory organs, five motor organs, *manas*, *buddhi* and *mukhya praana*. There is no way we can choose any one of them as out of the group to fit in to the number 12. If *mukhya praana* is to be excluded for the reason that he is not driven at the desire of *jeeva*, some such special feature is available for all other *indriyas* as well, like the capability to see for eyes, to hear for ears etc.

Since all of these are under the control of God, they should be treated on par.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ मुख्यप्राणं ऋते द्वादशानामेवेन्द्रियत्वम् । "द्वादशैवेन्द्रियाण्याहुः प्राणो मुख्यस्त्वनिन्द्रियम्" (पौत्रायणश्रुति) इत्यादिविशेषश्रुतेः । इदं द्रवणरूपयुक्त्युपेतसामान्यश्रुतेस्तु मुख्यप्राणेतरविषयत्वसम्भवात् । न च प्राणस्य चक्षुराद्यविशेषः । तस्य इदं द्रवणयुक्तसर्वप्राणनियन्तृत्वेन च ईश्वरसाम्यस्य चक्षुरादीनां तदभावस्य "द्रवतां हीन्द्रियाणांतु" इति

(पौत्रायणश्रुति) “स्थित एव हीदं मुख्यः प्राणः करोति कारयति”
 (पौत्रायणश्रुति) इत्यादिश्रुतिसिद्धत्वात् । तस्येतरप्राणवदीशवशत्वेऽपि
 इतरप्राणानामिव जीवप्रयत्नापेक्षया ईशवशत्वाभावेन वैलक्षण्याच्चेति ॥११॥

Indriyas are 12 in number with the exclusion of *mukhya praana*. *Veda* clearly puts it as “*indriyas* are only twelve. *Mukhya praana* is not an *indriya*”. While all other *indriyas* have the quality of running towards their respective objects, *mukhya praana* stands above them as their regulator like God. He does not just do the things but makes other *indriyas* do the tasks. Hence he is not similar to other *indriyas* as described in the previous para. This apart, he is different from others because he does not move towards the objects but gets the things done by staying at his own place. Though he is under the control of God like other *indriyas*, there is a significant difference in that, his actions are not based on the attempts of *jeevas* as in the case of other *jeevas*.

॥ ॐ संज्ञामूर्तिकृप्तिस्तु त्रिवृत्कुर्वत उपदेशात् ॐ ॥ १२ ॥

samjnaa-moorthi-klriptistu trivritkurvata upadeshaat - 12

मुख्यप्राणचिन्तनानन्तरं विरिञ्चविषयचिन्ता क्रियते तस्यैव विरिञ्चत्वादिति संगतिः। प्राक्चिन्तितप्राणानां आश्रयत्वात् (आयतनत्वात्) तत् प्रसङ्गसन्निधापितं शरीरं तदादिवस्तुजातं किं विरिञ्चसृष्टं उत परमात्मसृष्टमिति संदेहः । “यस्माद्विरेचयेत्सर्वं विरिञ्चस्तेन भण्यते” इति (ब्राह्म) स्मृत्युक्त्या विरेचकत्वापरपर्यायतत्त्वसृष्ट्वरूपविरिञ्चत्वयुक्तियुक्तायाः “विरिञ्चो वा इदं सर्वं विरेचयति” इति (गौपवन) श्रुतेः “परमाद्ध्येते नामरूपे व्याक्रियेते” इति (आग्निवेश्य) श्रुतितो बलवत्त्वात् । मुख्यार्थसम्भवे वियत्पादीयन्यायेन द्वारस्रष्टृपरत्वकल्पनायोगात् विरिञ्चसृष्टमिति पूर्वः पक्षः ॥

This chapter discusses *Virincha* (*chaturmukha brahma*), for he is himself *mukha praana*, the subject of discussion of previous

chapter. The body is where *indriyas* reside. Whether this body and all the objects around are created by *Virincha* or by God is the subject of discussion. *Brahma puraana* says that *chaturmukha* is called *virincha* for the very reason that he creates everything. *Sruti* also says "It is quite known that *virincha* is the creator of the entire world". Since the vedic statement is backed by the logic provided in the quoted *puraana* text, this is powerful enough to stall the opposition of another *sruti* that says "the entire of this universe comprising of names and their objects are created by God". Going by the logic provided in the section starting with "*na viyad asruteh*" (2.1.1), while the primary meaning fits in, there is no scope for secondary meaning to consider *chaturmukha* as an intermediary in the creation and not the primary one.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ शरीरादिवस्तुसृष्टेः पृथिव्यादिभूतत्रयमिश्रीभावरूप-
त्रिवृत्करणसापेक्षत्वात् तस्य च "सेयं देवतेमास्तिस्रो देवता" (छा.६-३-३)
इत्यादिश्रुत्या विष्णुधर्मत्वात् विष्णुनैव देहादिरूपनामप्रपञ्चसृष्टिः न विरिञ्चतः ।
प्रागुक्तयुक्त्युपेतश्रुतिस्तु "ब्रह्माद्यास्तदवान्तरा" इति (पाद्म) स्मृत्या
अवान्तरसृष्टिरेति॥१२॥

It is essential that the three elementary objects of *prithivi*, *jala* and *tejas* need to be mixed in various proportions before the said mixture is used as a raw material for the creation of various objects. This admixture is done exclusively by God. *Chandogya upanishat* says, the same person who created *tejas*, *prithivi* and *jala*, entered them in his *aniruddha* form and mixed them in different proportions to create other objects. Hence he is the creator of these bodies and all other objects. The statement of *sruti* that *chaturmukha* is called *virincha* because he has created all is with reference to the subsequent creations and not the primary ones. This fact is confirmed by *padma puraana* as "*Brahma* and others are creators of subsequent objects".

•॥ ॐ मांसादिभौमं यथाशब्दमितरयोश्च ॐ ॥ १३ ॥

maamsaadi-bhoumam yathaa-shabdam itarayoshcha - 13

॥ ॐ वैशेष्यात्तु तद्वादस्तद्वादः ॐ ॥

vaisheshyaattu tadvaadas-tadvaadah;

पूर्वं देहादेः कर्तोक्तः । इह तु उपादानमुच्यत इति सङ्गतिः । मूर्तिपदेन पूर्वत्र प्रकृतो देहः किं आप्यः किं वा पार्थिवः उत तैजसः भूतत्रयात्मको वेति संदेहः । मांसादौ तृप्तिजनकत्वदृष्टेः तर्पकत्वयुक्त्युपेतया आपः शरीरमिति श्रुत्या आप्य इत्येकः पूर्वः पक्षः। काठिन्यगन्धवत्त्वादियुक्त्युपेततया "पृथिवी शरीरम्" (अप्येति) इति श्रुत्या (बृ. ५-२-१३) पार्थिव इत्यन्यः । औष्ण्यदर्शनरूपयुक्त्युपेतया "सोऽग्नर्देवयोऽन्या आहुतिभ्यः सम्भूय हिरण्यशरीर" (ऐ. ७-४) इत्यादिश्रुत्या तैजस इत्यपरः । "इमास्तिस्रो देवताः पुरुषं प्राप्य" (छां. ६-४-७) इत्यादौ श्रुतोऽपि भूतत्रयात्मकत्वपक्षः आप एव शरीरमित्यादिविशिष्योक्त्यनुपपत्तेरयुक्त एवेति ॥

In this chapter the source material of the physical bodies is the subject of discussion.

One says, water is the raw material for these bodies. One experiences satisfaction on eating meat. It is water that is characterized by the quality of providing satisfaction. *Veda* says "body is water", meaning it is made of water.

Another says the hardness and smell that we see in bodies are the characteristics of *prithivi*. *Sruti* also says on the death of a person, his body disintegrates in *prithivi* indicating that it was made of *prithivi*.

The third says that the body is made of *tejas* (energy). We see the warmth in the bodies. *Veda* also states that post death of a person,

when his body is offered in fire, it moves along with other offerings to *swarga* in golden form.

Though another *sruti* indicates that all the three join together to form the body, the expression that water alone is the body etc., do not allow acceptance of other substances also as material cause for the bodies.

सिद्धान्तस्तु ॥ देहस्यानेकभूतप्रकृतिकत्वेऽपि तत्तद्भूतविशेषसंयोगापेक्षया विशिष्योक्त्युपपत्तेः । "यत्कठिनं सा पृथिवी यद्द्रवं तदापः यदुष्णं तत्तेजः" इति (गर्भ. ३) श्रुतेरनेकभूतोपादानक एव देह इति ॥ १३ ॥

Body is made of multiple *bhootas* (basic building blocks of *prithivi* etc). The reference to each of such material as the cause is related to the components that exhibit such qualities. *Garbha sruti* clarifies the aspect "That which is hard, is *prithivi*. That which is liquid, is water. That which is hot / warm is *tejas*".

॥ इति श्रीराघवेन्द्रयतिकृतायां न्यायमुक्तावल्यां द्वितीयाध्यायस्य चतुर्थः पादः ॥
॥ द्वितीयाध्यायः समाप्तः ॥

Brahma Sutras are the coded texts that guide us in understanding the Vedas that often look contradictory, illogical etc. Great philosophers like Shankaracharya, Ramanujacharya and Madhwacharya have written extensive commentaries on these Brahma Sutras to facilitate an understanding of Brahma Sutras. Sri Sri Raghavendra Swamiji had written "NyaayaMuktaavali" about 350 years ago in Sanskrit explaining the meaning of Brahma Sutras chapter-by-chapter based on the Bhashya (Commentary) of Sri Mahdwacharya and Sri Jayateertha. The language and contents are of high order. An attempt is made here to bring the contents to the English Reader along with the original text.

The Author, Ravindranath Kadlabal is a Graduate in Laws and Post Graduate in Sanskrit. He has retired as an Asst. General Manager from a Public Sector Bank. He has studied Madhwa Philosophy under the able guidance of Sri Narasimhachar Korlahalli and is himself teaching Madhwa Philosophy to many students on a daily basis. His earlier publications are 1. Brahma Sutras - An introduction through aNubhaashya of Sri Madhwacharya 2. Isavasya Upanishat with Sankara, Ramaanujeeya and Madhwa Commentaries

